

MAGICAL HYMNS FROM ROMAN EGYPT

A STUDY OF GREEK AND EGYPTIAN
TRADITIONS OF DIVINITY

LJUBA MERLINA BORTOLANI



MAGICAL HYMNS FROM ROMAN EGYPT

A STUDY OF GREEK AND EGYPTIAN TRADITIONS OF DIVINITY

This interdisciplinary study investigates the divine personas in the so-called magical hymns of the Greek magical papyri which, in a corpus usually seen as a significant expression of religious syncretism with strong Egyptian influence, were long considered to be the ‘most authentically Greek’ contribution. Fifteen hymns receive a line-by-line commentary focusing on religious concepts, ritual practice, language and style. The overarching aim is to categorize the nature of divinity according to its Greek or Egyptian elements, examining earlier Greek and Egyptian sources and religious-magical traditions in order to find textual or conceptual parallels. Are the gods of the magical hymns Greek or Egyptian in nature? Did the magical hymns originate in a Greek or Egyptian cultural background? The book tries to answer these questions and to shed light on the religious plurality and/or fusion of the two cultures in the treatment of divinity in the Greek magical papyri.

LJUBA MERLINA BORTOLANI has studied classics, Egyptology and papyrology and has been a Postdoctoral Researcher in the ‘Cluster of Excellence: Asia and Europe in a Global Context’ at the University of Heidelberg in the project ‘Cultural plurality and the fusion of traditions between East and West: the magic of transculturality’.

MAGICAL HYMNS FROM ROMAN EGYPT

A STUDY OF GREEK AND
EGYPTIAN TRADITIONS
OF DIVINITY

LJUBA MERLINA BORTOLANI



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107108387

© Ljuba Merlina Bortolani 2016

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2016

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Names: Bortolani, Ljuba Merlina, 1980- author.

Title: Magical hymns from Roman Egypt : a study of Greek and Egyptian traditions of divinity / Ljuba Merlina Bortolani.

Description: New York : Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016001614 | ISBN 9781107108387 (Hardback)

Subjects: LCSH: Magic, Greek—Early works to 1800. | Magic, Egyptian—Early works to 1800. | Greece—Religion. | Egypt—Religion. | Papyri graecae magicae.

Classification: LCC BF1591 .B67 2016 | DDC 133.4/30932—dc23 LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2016001614>

ISBN 978-1-107-10838-7 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	<i>page</i> x
NOTES ON THE TEXT	xi
QUOTED EGYPTIAN HYMNS IN BD AND ÄHG	xii
ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
INTRODUCTION	I
Preliminary remarks	3
Greeks and Egyptians in Graeco-Roman Egypt and the survival of indigenous religious tradition: an outline	3
‘Magical’ papyri and ‘magical’ hymns: notes on the features of a ‘genre’	12
<i>PGM</i> and <i>PDM</i>	19
Purpose and methodology	25
Magical hymns	28
History of studies	28
Background of the magical hymns	32
Egyptian and Greek hymnography: a brief comparison	39
Selection and organization of the material	50
<i>PART I. HYMNS TO THE MALE DEITY</i>	57
HYMNS 1 AND 2: four versions of a hymn to Apollo-Helios-Horus	59

CONTENTS

HYMN 1. Version one, to Apollo: I 296–327 and 341–7 (fourth/fifth century)	59
Commentary	63
HYMN 2. Versions two, three and four to Helios- Horus: IV 436–61 [A], 1957–89 [B] (fourth century) and VIII 74–81 (fourth/fifth century) [C]	97
Commentary	102
Conclusions to 1 and 2	114
HYMN 3. Hymn to Helios: III 198–230 (early fourth century)	117
Commentary	120
Conclusions	138
HYMN 4. Hymn to Helios: III 549–58 (early fourth century)	140
Commentary	141
Conclusions	149
HYMN 5. Hymn to Horus Harpocrates: IV 939–48 (fourth century)	151
Commentary	153
Conclusions	165
HYMN 6. Hymn to Apollo: II 2–7 (fourth century)	169
Commentary	170
Conclusions	174

CONTENTS

HYMN 7. Hymn to Apollo-Helios: II 81–102	
(fourth century)	175
Commentary	178
Conclusions	189
HYMN 8. Hymn to Apollo: VI 6–45 (second/third century)	
(second/third century)	191
Commentary	194
Conclusions	200
HYMN 9. Hymn to the creator god: XII 244–52	
(second/third century)	202
Commentary	204
Conclusions	212
<i>PART II. HYMNS TO THE FEMALE</i>	
<i>CHTHONIC/LUNAR DEITY</i>	
	217
HYMN 10. Hymn to Hecate-Persephone and her followers: IV 1399–434 (fourth century)	
(fourth century)	219
Commentary	222
Conclusions	241
HYMN 11. Hymn to Hecate-Selene: IV 2242–347	
(fourth century)	243
Commentary	250
Conclusions	277

CONTENTS

HYMN 12. Hymn to Hecate-Selene-Persephone- Artemis: IV 2522–67 (fourth century)	280
Commentary	283
Conclusions	296
HYMN 13. Hecate-Selene's διαβολή: IV 2574–610 [A] and IV 2643–74 [B] (fourth century)	298
Commentary	303
Conclusions	307
HYMN 14. Hymn to Hecate-Selene-Persephone- Artemis: IV 2714–83 (fourth century)	309
Commentary	312
Conclusions	321
HYMN 15. Hymn to Hecate-Selene-Persephone- Artemis: IV 2786–870 (fourth century)	322
Commentary	326
Conclusions	335
CONCLUSIONS	337
Deities in context: aims of the magical procedures	337
Language, structure and style in relation to contents	344
Homeric language	345
Judaeo-Christian vocabulary	349
Comparison with the <i>Orphic Hymns</i>	351
Style and structure	354

CONTENTS

Divine attributes in cultural backgrounds	365
The Egyptian background of the hymns' compilers	379
The interaction of religion, the seclusion of magic	386
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 393
INDEX OF SUBJECTS	43 ¹
INDEX OF DISCUSSED EGYPTIAN EPITHETS	44 ¹
INDEX LOCORUM	44 ²
INDEX OF GREEK WORDS	444
Personal names of deities and divine entities	464
<i>Voces magicae</i>	465

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is a reworked version of the thesis I wrote for my Ph.D. in Classics in interdisciplinary context (Egyptology), funded by AHRC, at University College London, which was defended in 2012. A special thanks goes to my supervisors, Dr Nikolaos Gonis and Professor John W. Tait, for their constant and precious support and patience. Valuable suggestions for the improvement of this study came also from my viva examiners, Dr Martina Ninas-Nerpel and Professor Ian Rutherford, whom I thank for their accurate assessment. The revisions of the book took place during my post-doctoral research in Heidelberg at the Karl Jasper Centre, ‘Cluster of Excellence Asia and Europe in a global context’ within the project MC 10.1 ‘The magic of transculturality’, coordinated by Professors William D. Furley and Joachim F. Quack. They very kindly agreed to read my drafts, and I was thus lucky enough to benefit from their punctual comments and insightful remarks. I would also like to thank Cambridge University Press in the person of Dr Michael Sharp for agreeing to publish this book, and the British Library, the Musée du Louvre and Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, the Staatliche Museen, Berlin, the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden, for providing the digital images I used to check the texts against the papyri. Last but not least, a hearty thanks to Professor Francesco Piero Franchi for his inspirational knowledge of Greek and for the many enlightening exchanges, to Jacqui Rochman for being such a generous and wonderful hostess during my three years and a half in London and having thus allowed me to complete my Ph.D., and to Maria Luisa Neri for being the only person who knows this book nearly as much as I do.

Heidelberg, December 2014

NOTES ON THE TEXT

| Marks line end in the papyrus (but it is omitted both when line end corresponds to verse end in an entire hymn and when more versions of the same hymn are presented together)

Intro., I, I... Boldface marks internal references both to the book's parts (**Intro., I, II, Concl.**) and to the single hymns (Arabic numerals from **I** to **15**): e.g. **I** p. 10 (**Part I**, page 10); **Intro.** n.4 (**Introduction**, footnote 4); **II** n.6 (**Part II**, footnote 6); **I.15** (**Hymn I**, line 15). The hymn number is omitted only when the reference is to lines of the same hymn under examination.

Boldface is also used to identify the relevant metrical sections within the spells' description in the introduction to the single hymns (e.g. **hymn**), and to mark different subgroups of a special section of the commentary on hymn **II**.

I.1, I.2... References to lines in the hymns always point not only to the verses in the text, but also, and especially, to their commentary. Therefore, e.g. 'see **7.4**' means 'see **Hymn 7** line 4, text and commentary *ad loc.*'.

QUOTED EGYPTIAN HYMNS IN BD AND *ÄHG*

Berlin 6910	Berlin, Königliche Museen, 1913–24, II.63–71	<i>ÄHG</i> 169=BD 70
CGMC 42237	Legrain 1906, III.88–9	BD 85
DMamm. 31	Daumas 1959	BD 91
Hibis: hymns to Amun-Re from the temple of Hibis:		
Klotz 2006, I (Invocation hymn)	Davies 1953, pl. 31 (horizontal inscription)	<i>ÄHG</i> 128=BD 88
Klotz 2006, II (Hymn to the Ba's)	Davies 1953, pl. 31 (vertical inscription)	<i>ÄHG</i> 128=BD 88
Klotz 2006, III (Great Amun hymn)	Davies 1953, pl. 33	<i>ÄHG</i> 130=BD 90
Klotz 2006, IV (Creator hymn)	Davies 1953, pl. 32	<i>ÄHG</i> 129=BD 89
Hymn to the Nile	Helck 1972	<i>ÄHG</i> 242=BD 156
Kom-Ombo (hymn to Sobek)	Junker 1931, 54–5	BD 127
Medamud (hymn to Montu)	Drioton 1926, 38–40	BD 145
O. Cairo 25208	Erman 1900, 27–8	<i>ÄHG</i> 193=BD 37
O. Cairo 25209	Erman 1900, 30–3	BD 19
P. Berlin 3048	Wolf 1929	<i>ÄHG</i> 143=BD 118
P. Berlin 3049	Berlin, Königliche Museen, 1901–11, II pl. 10–26	<i>ÄHG</i> 127–127b=BD 81
P. Berlin 3050	Sauneron 1953	<i>ÄHG</i> 22 A–D=BD 82

QUOTED EGYPTIAN HYMNS IN BD AND *ÄHG*

P. Berlin 3055	Berlin, Königliche Museen 1901–11, I pl. 6–7, 13–19	<i>ÄHG</i> 119–26=BD 83
P. BM 9901	Budge 1898, I 8–10	<i>ÄHG</i> 42 A–B=BD 65
P. Cairo 58032	Golénischeff 1927, 169–96	<i>ÄHG</i> 131=BD 79
P. Cairo 58038	Luiselli 2004	<i>ÄHG</i> 87=BD 69
P. Chester Beatty IV	Gardiner 1935, II 31–5	<i>ÄHG</i> 195
P. Leiden I 350	Gardiner 1905	<i>ÄHG</i> 132–42, 194=BD 72
P. Louvre 3292, H	Nagel 1929	<i>ÄHG</i> 45
P. Ramesseum 6	Gardiner 1957	<i>ÄHG</i> 203 A–B=BD 126
Stele BM 551	Meyer 1877	<i>ÄHG</i> 58=BD 95
Stele BM 826	London, British Museum 1911–, VIII 22–5	<i>ÄHG</i> 89=BD 68
Stele BM 834	London, British Museum 1911–, VII 21	BD 153
‘Tura hymn’	Bakir 1943	<i>ÄHG</i> 88 = BD 74

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ÄHG</i>	Assmann 1975
BD	Barucq and Daumas 1980
BG	Brashear 1995, Glossary (reference to the <i>vox magica/voces magicae</i> discussed in the text whenever not otherwise stated)
DD	Delatte and Derchain 1964
<i>HH</i>	<i>Homeric Hymns</i>
<i>LGG</i>	Leitz 2002–3
MeMi	Meyer and Mirecki 1995
MiMe	Mirecki and Meyer 2002
MT	Merkelbach and Totti 1990, 1991
<i>OH</i>	<i>Orphic Hymns</i>
Pr	Preisendanz and Henrichs 1973–4
<i>Suppl.</i>	Daniel and Maltomini 1990, 1992
<i>Wb</i>	Erman and Grapow 1926–63
<i>BoD</i>	<i>Book of the Dead</i> : as philological discussions are not in question and most of the quoted chapters are found in the papyrus of Ani, Von Dassow, Wasserman, Faulkner and Goelet 1994 here provides the framework for citation (the lack of transliterated text is compensated for by plates). For the hieroglyphic text see the philologically unsatisfactory (but unsuperseded) edition of

ABBREVIATIONS

	Budge 1898. Line-by-line transliteration from various papyri including Ani can be found in Carrier 2009
<i>CCAG</i>	<i>Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum</i> , Brussels, 1898–1953
D	Chassinat 1934–2000; Cauville 1998–2001
DMamm.	Daumas 1959
<i>DT</i>	Audollent 1904
E	De Rochemonteix and Chassinat 1897–1985
<i>FGrH</i>	Jacoby, F. (ed.) <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , 2nd edn, Leiden 1954–69
<i>GDRK</i>	Heitsch, E. (ed.) <i>Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit</i> , I–II, Göttingen 1961–4
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones graecae</i> , Berlin 1873–
<i>IGR</i>	Cagnat, R. (ed.) <i>Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes</i> , Paris 1901–27, repr. Chicago 1975
<i>IGUR</i>	Moretti, L. (ed.) <i>Inscriptiones graecae urbis Romae</i> , Rome 1968–90
<i>LdÄ</i>	Helck and Otto 1972–92
<i>LMC</i>	Ackermann, H. C. and Gisler, J.-R. (eds.) <i>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</i> , Zürich 1981–
<i>LM</i>	Roscher 1884–1937
LSJ	Liddell, Scott, Jones and McKenzie 1996 (reference to the lemma discussed in the text whenever not otherwise stated; the numbers following LSJ refer to internal subdivisions within the single lemma)

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>NP</i>	Cancik and Schneider 1996–2003
<i>OGIS</i>	Dittenberger, W. (ed.) <i>Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae</i> , Leipzig 1903–5
<i>PCG</i>	Kassel, R. and Austin, C. (eds.) <i>Poetae comici Graeci</i> , I–VIII, Berlin 1983–2001
<i>PMG</i>	Page, D. L. (ed.) <i>Poetae melici Graeci</i> , 2nd edn, Oxford 1967
<i>Pyr.</i>	Sethe 1908–22; Faulkner 1969; Allen 2005
<i>RAC</i>	Klauser 1950–
<i>RÄRG</i>	Bonnet 1971
<i>RE</i>	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , 1894–1963
<i>RICIS</i>	Bricault 2005
<i>SB</i>	Preisigke 1915–
<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> , Leiden 1923–71, then Amsterdam 1979 to date
<i>TrGF</i>	Snell, B. et al. (eds.) <i>Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta</i> , Göttingen 1971–2004
<i>AAASH</i>	<i>Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>
<i>ABSA</i>	<i>Annual of the British School at Athens</i>
<i>ACS</i>	American Classical Studies
<i>AJA</i>	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>ÄAT</i>	Ägypten und Altes Testament

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> , ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase, Berlin 1972–
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
<i>AOrientHung</i>	<i>Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>
<i>AoF</i>	<i>Altorientalische Forschungen</i>
<i>APf</i>	<i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete</i>
<i>ARG</i>	<i>Archiv für Religionsgeschichte</i>
<i>ASAE</i>	<i>Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte</i>
<i>ASAW</i>	<i>Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig</i> , Phil.-hist. Kl.
ASP	American Studies in Papyrology
BAe	Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca
<i>BACE</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Australian Centre for Egyptology</i>
<i>BASP</i>	<i>The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</i>
BdÉ	Bibliothèque d'Étude
BEFAR	Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome
<i>BES</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Egyptological Seminar</i>
<i>BICS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies</i>
<i>BIFAO</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'Institut français d'Archéologie Orientale</i>
<i>BMM</i>	<i>Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin</i>
<i>BMusHongr</i>	<i>Bulletin du Musée Hongrois des Beaux-Arts</i>
<i>BSFÉ</i>	<i>Bulletin de la Société Française d'Égyptologie</i>

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>CdÉ</i>	<i>Chronique d'Égypte</i>
CÉNiM	Les Cahiers Égypte Nilotique et Méditerranéenne
CGMC	Catalogue Général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire
<i>CJ</i>	<i>The Classical Journal</i>
<i>ClAnt</i>	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
<i>ClW</i>	<i>The Classical Weekly</i>
<i>CPh</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>The Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CR</i>	<i>The Classical Review</i>
DE	Discussions in Egyptology
<i>DFIFAO</i>	<i>Documents de Fouilles de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale</i>
<i>EA</i>	<i>Epigraphica Anatolica</i>
ÉPRO	Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire romain
FIFAO	Fouilles de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale
<i>GB</i>	<i>Grazer Beiträge</i>
<i>GM</i>	<i>Göttinger Miszellen</i>
<i>G&R</i>	<i>Greece & Rome</i>
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
HÄB	Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge
<i>HR</i>	<i>History of Religions</i>

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>HThR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JARCE</i>	<i>Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt</i>
<i>JEA</i>	<i>The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>The Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>J(K)DAI</i>	<i>Jahrbuch des (Kaiserlichen) Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JRA</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Archaeology</i>
<i>JVEG</i>	<i>Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux</i>
<i>LingAeg</i>	<i>Lingua Aegyptia: Journal of Egyptian Language Studies</i>
<i>MAI</i>	Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres
<i>MHNH</i>	<i>MHNH: Revista internacional de investigación sobre magia y astrología antiguas</i>
<i>MH</i>	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
<i>MIFAO</i>	Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire
<i>MRE</i>	Monographies Reine Elisabeth
<i>NouvClio</i>	<i>La Nouvelle Clio</i>
<i>OBO</i>	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
<i>OC</i>	<i>Oriens Christianus</i>
<i>OLA</i>	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>OMRO</i>	<i>Oudheidkundige Mededeelingen van het Rijksmuseum van Oudheden te Leiden</i>
<i>ORA</i>	Orientalische Religionen in der Antike
<i>PÄe</i>	Probleme der Ägyptologie
<i>PIFAO</i>	Publications de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire
<i>PLB</i>	Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava
<i>PSBA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology</i>
<i>QUCC</i>	<i>Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica</i>
<i>RBPH</i>	<i>Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire</i>
<i>RdÉ</i>	<i>Revue d'Égyptologie</i>
<i>RÉG</i>	<i>Revue d'Études Grecques</i>
<i>RGRW</i>	Religions in the Graeco-Roman World
<i>RhM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
<i>RVV</i>	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten
<i>SAK</i>	<i>Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur</i>
<i>SAOC</i>	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
<i>SEL</i>	<i>Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico</i>
<i>SMSR</i>	<i>Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni</i>
<i>SO</i>	<i>Symbolae Osloenses</i>
<i>SWGS</i>	Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions (and Proceedings) of the American Philological Association</i>

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ThZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
UGAAe	Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens
UNHAI	Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>WdO</i>	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
WS	Wiener Studien
<i>ZÄS</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde</i>
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

INTRODUCTION

Since the time of the largest find of magical papyri at the beginning of the nineteenth century,¹ the study of the Graeco-Egyptian magical literature of the second–fifth centuries AD has undergone at least two stages of misconceptions.² At first, it was neglected as the classicist ideal of the period prevented most scholars from seeing the potential of textual material that was considered the degenerate product of syncretistic folk superstition. Then, with the beginning of the twentieth century, an interest in ancient magic started to awaken and increasingly developed within several disciplines up to the present. In 1928–31 Karl Preisendanz and his collaborators assembled all the surviving material known at the time in the edition that remains the basic tool for a study of the corpus: *Papyri Graecae Magicae – Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri I–II (PGM)*.³ Despite the merit of making the texts easily accessible, they decided to omit the Demotic sections of the papyri without giving any explanation,⁴ and thus unintentionally contributed to strengthening a second misleading conception. The Greek

¹ The so-called Theban Magical Library: a group of papyri discovered by villagers in Thebes some time before 1828 and acquired by Giovanni Anastasi (1780–1857), the Swedish–Norwegian Consul General in Egypt. Between 1828 and 1839 he sold his collection of papyri to different museums, thus scattering it all over Europe. Among the thousands of texts there was also the ‘Library’, together with other magical papyri of uncertain provenance: a collection containing the most impressive magical texts (as far as contents and conservation status are concerned) ever discovered. Unfortunately, almost nothing is known about the circumstances and place of the find. Brashear 1995, 3400–5. Cf. Zago 2010, especially 31–71.

² For the history of studies and relative bibliography see Brashear 1995; Ritner 1995a.

³ The third volume, containing indices and explanations of the magical words, reached only the stage of galley proofs (1941), photocopies of which are still available to scholars.

⁴ It appears even more significant if we consider that in many cases the Greek and the Demotic sections were written by the same scribe.

INTRODUCTION

language tended to be confused with ethnic Greek culture, so that, even if the complex tangle of multicultural religious influences was certainly recognized and taken into consideration as one of the fundamental characteristics of these texts, they continued to be studied mainly by classicists. For example, though Egyptian tradition was clearly one of the main constituents of the background of the *PGM*, the separation between the Greek and Demotic material, as well as the impasse created by the usually specialized linguistic competences, prevented Egyptologists from taking an interest in this corpus for a long time.

With the end of the last century, Graeco-Egyptian magical texts seem to have finally found their place within the study of ancient Mediterranean cultures. All the Demotic material was available to scholars by the 1970s, though in separate publications (*PDM*),⁵ together with the second edition of Preisendanz's *PGM* revised by Albert Henrichs. A first attempt to join the two separate corpora was made by Hans Dieter Betz who, supervising a team of both classicists and Egyptologists, in 1986 published *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation – Including the Demotic Spells*, which, compared to Preisendanz's edition, included fifty new papyri that had appeared in various publications since 1941. Even if this volume cannot be considered a proper 'edition', as it does not include the original texts, it has two great merits: it set a standard for future studies underlining the essential unity of Greek and Egyptian magical texts and it made them accessible to the general public. In 1990–2 Robert W. Daniel and Franco Maltomini published one hundred new Greek texts⁶ with translations and notes in the two volumes of *Supplementum Magicum*. The core of the corpus was thus established, while other magical texts have continued to appear in

⁵ Griffith and Thompson 1904–9; Bell, Nock and Thompson 1933; Johnson 1975; Johnson 1977; for other minor documents, cf. Ritner 1995a, 3343–5. See also Quack 2008. For more details see **Intro** n.56.

⁶ Not only on papyrus, but also on metal and wooden tablets, ostraca and other supports. Forty-one of these magical texts had already appeared in translation in Betz's edition.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

various publications up to the present. At this stage, the change in scholarly attitudes towards Graeco-Egyptian magic was complete.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Greeks and Egyptians in Graeco-Roman Egypt and the survival of indigenous religious tradition: an outline

The recognition of the importance of the Egyptian element in the *PGM* raises some particular questions: who wrote or collected these texts? Greeks or Egyptians? This in its turn implies a more general issue: can we distinguish between ethnic identities in Graeco-Roman Egypt? And what about cultural identities and religious traditions? Are the *PGM* the product of a hybrid society or not? An extensive account of the scholarly opinion on the issues of ethnicity, cultural identity and plurality or fusion of religious traditions in Graeco-Roman Egypt lies outside the scope of this study, but I will summarize some main points which are essential to establish the basis of my methodological approach to the *PGM*.⁷

First, it has to be noted that, since the main interest here is the cultural set-up, we can focus on the Greek and Egyptian elements and leave aside the Roman. In fact, under Roman rule Egypt remained a Greek-occupied land and, despite the political and social changes, it is hard to identify any specific penetration of Roman tradition as far as cultural interactions are concerned.⁸ Furthermore, when dealing with the *PGM*, such a Graeco-Egyptian focus is even more justified: Latin does not appear in the corpus and, more importantly, the compilatory nature of the *PGM* sets both the composition of these texts

⁷ For a thorough treatment of the subject see the literature quoted throughout this chapter.

⁸ Even the use of Latin remained very limited and mainly confined to the military administration: Bowman 1986, 158; Bagnall 1993, 231–2, 244; Montecchi 1988, 445; Evans 2012; Jördens 2012, 250–2; Depauw 2012, 500–1.

INTRODUCTION

and the origin of their sources earlier than their late date (though, as far as the composition is concerned, hardly before the time of the Roman conquest: see below pp. 22–3 point 3).

The Greek immigrants in Ptolemaic Egypt who lived in the few Greek poleis (especially Naukratis, where Greeks already settled in the sixth century BC, Alexandria, Ptolemais and later Antinoopolis) might have often succeeded in keeping their ethnic identity distinct. However, mainly in the countryside, marriages between indigenous Egyptians and Greek settlers were common so that a few generations after the conquest of Alexander the Great in 332 BC ethnicity became difficult to determine. The study of onomastics can be misleading too since the children of these mixed unions could be given Greek or Egyptian names, or indigenous Egyptians could take a ‘second’ Greek name (and sometimes vice versa).⁹ They could also acquire the status of ‘Hellenes’ through military service or playing a role in the administration, but the prerequisite for, or the result of, these activities must have been a certain degree of Hellenization.¹⁰ When Alexander conquered Egypt, the necessity for a smooth takeover of the Egyptian administration created a system of cooperation with the Egyptian upper class. Soon after, the increase in the demand for ‘Hellenized’ officials promoted the diffusion of Greek schooling throughout Egypt, and whoever, regardless of ethnic origin, wanted to have a

⁹ Lewis 1986, 27–36; Huzar 1988, 351, 356–7; Peremans 1981; Bagnall 1993, 232–3; Vanderpe 2012, 268–9, 271–2; cf. Colin 2001, 8–15.

¹⁰ In the Ptolemaic period ‘Hellenes’ identifies a category of people enjoying some fiscal privileges, but the term does not seem to refer to ethnic Greeks or descendants of Greeks exclusively. Even when Augustus changed the social organization establishing that everyone who was not a Roman citizen, a citizen of the Greek poleis, or a Jew was ‘Egyptian’, this categorization did not reflect any ‘ethnic’ reality. On the whole subject see Thompson 2001; Thompson 1994, 75; Bowman 1986, 63; Lewis 1983, 31–5; Lewis 1986, 24–5, 29–30, e.g. 139–52; Lewis 1970, 10; Huzar 1988, 362–4; Bagnall 1993, 232; Bagnall 1997; Vanderpe 2012, 262–7; Jördens 2012, especially 249–50; Stephens 2003, 241–2. See e.g. the example of Horpakhpeš in Klotz and LeBlanc 2012.

position in the administration had to learn Greek: as the language of the ruling class it became a sort of *lingua franca* and was used by indigenous Egyptians too.¹¹ From the papyrological documentation we know that a wide range of Greek authors was available to the literate upper class. Since ‘classical’ authors had always been employed for the teaching of Greek, whoever learned the writing also acquired some familiarity with Greek literature, i.e. with one of the highest expressions of Greek culture.¹² Nevertheless, the use of Greek did not necessarily indicate an exclusively Greek cultural background, and despite the possibility of mixed unions and/or Hellenization, the cultural differences were still felt: many natives did not learn Greek and had fiscal disadvantages; the Ptolemaic legal system had separate courts for Greek and Egyptian speakers and manifestations of mutual contempt are often attested. The general impression is that Greeks and Egyptians remained culturally more distinct than it would seem at a first glance.¹³

An interesting example is the use of the two Egyptian scripts, Demotic and Hieratic. First, Egyptian literacy had always been rooted in the temples since it was fundamental for the performance of temple rituals and it was in the ‘Houses of life’, annexed to the temples, that texts were copied and studied and writing and reading were often taught, so that the role of the scribe was

¹¹ Welles 1970, 508–9; Lewis 1986, 26–7; Ritner 1995a, 3361; Depauw 1997, 41–4; Depauw 2012, 494; Frankfurter 1998, 248–50; Criboire 1996, 43–8; Thompson 1994, 72–5.

¹² Thompson 1992; Thompson 1994, 76–7; Bowman 1986, 61, 122; cf. Bagnall 1993, 99–100; Depauw 2012, 496; Criboire 1996, 48–9; Criboire 2001, 178–80, 192–204, 225–38; cf. Miguélez Caverio 2008, 23–9, 97–105, 197–263.

¹³ See Thompson 2001, 302–3, 306–11, 313–15; Thompson 1994, 80–2; Lewis 1983, 40–1, 156–7; Lewis 1986, 4–5, 26–36, 85–7; Bowman 1986, 61, 125–6; Bagnall 1997, 7; Huzar 1988, 359–62; Montecocchi 1988, 420–1; Vandorpe 2012, 268–70; Jördens 2012, 253–7; Bowman 1986, 61, 125–6; especially on the Ptolemaic legal system Yiftach-Firanko 2009, 541–52; Manning 2010, 165–201.

INTRODUCTION

hardly separable from priestly office.¹⁴ In particular, the knowledge of Hieratic had been confined to the temple scriptorium since about the seventh century BC, following the introduction of Demotic as the script of the administration. The latter in its turn, with the introduction of Greek, gradually lost its *raison d'être*. Demotic was confined to communication with those natives who did not know Greek and, as a literary language, was mainly kept alive by the 'hard core' of the Egyptian tradition, the temple scriptorium,¹⁵ where Demotic works (mainly cultic-religious texts, but also narrative and scientific literature) continued to be copied and composed at least until the second century AD.¹⁶ However, while Greek influences have been hypothesized in Demotic literature, Greek literature does not seem to show any particular Egyptianizing traits.¹⁷ This is not surprising if we consider that there were certainly many more 'Egyptians' reading Greek literature than 'Greeks' reading Egyptian. There are examples of Greek speakers who learned, or tried to learn, Demotic, but they are very few and must represent an exception.¹⁸ Though Egyptian texts might

¹⁴ Baines 1983, especially 580–3; Wente 1995, especially 2216, 2219–20; Vleeming 1994; Tait 1994, 190–2; Hoffmann 2012, 545–6; Cribiore 1996, 40; Clarysse 2009, 565–8, 573; cf. Williams 1972, 216; Jasnow and Zauzich 2005, I.33–6.

¹⁵ Depauw 2012, 494–9; Frankfurter 1998, 210–12; Sauneron 1962a; Cribiore 2001, 22–3; Dieleman 2005, 21–3; Ritner 1993, 204–14, 220–33; Thompson 1994, especially 82–3; by the end of the first century AD Demotic had almost disappeared from the administration, also owing to Roman policy, which strongly favoured Greek.

¹⁶ See Quack 2005a; also Depauw 1997, 24–6, 85–121; Hoffmann 2012; Jasnow 2002; cf. Mertens 1992, now outdated.

¹⁷ Thissen 1999; Podemann Sørensen 1992, especially 171–2; Bowman 1986, 162–4; Hoffmann 2012, 549–51; Jasnow 2002, 214–15. However, the subject is still debated: see Depauw 1997, 86; cf. e.g. Rutherford 2000; Stephens 2003, especially 6–12, 17–18, 254–7.

¹⁸ Especially in order to gain a living in medicine. See Bowman 1986, 124; cf. Lewis 1986, 153–6; also Fewster 2002, especially 236–45. Considering the difficulty of the script, compared to alphabetic Greek, and its relative uselessness for social ascent, Greek settlers and their descendants could not have been particularly keen on learning Demotic (or other Egyptian scripts).

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

be translated into Greek,¹⁹ their scant accessibility helped to keep Demotic literature the privileged field of expression of the Egyptian cultural background.²⁰ It is not by chance that Demotic was also more persistent in areas such as the Thebaid, which had a very small Greek population but powerful priestly and military indigenous families and was the site of various Egyptian rebellions.²¹ Furthermore, a proficient user of Demotic, not to mention Hieratic, must have come from the Egyptian priestly milieu and thus must have been in contact with the centre of the Egyptian cultural transmission, the temple.

It has often been pointed out that the survival of the indigenous tradition was closely connected with the Egyptian priesthood and temples, and thus with the persistence of religious traditions (it is not accidental that the last preserved Demotic texts, apart from the graffiti left in Philae by pilgrims and priests, belong to magico-religious literature).²² One of the purposes for which the Ptolemaic rulers preserved these indigenous institutions was the necessity to legitimize the small Greek immigrant elite. In order for the Ptolemies to present themselves as restored Pharaohs and be accepted by the population, it was necessary to promote a programme of construction and decoration of

¹⁹ E.g. the famous case of Manetho, whose *History of Egypt* seems to have been translated from Egyptian, or the *Myth of the eye of the sun*, for which we have both the Demotic and Greek versions: Dillery 1999; Depauw 1997, 92–3; West 1969; cf. Ryholt 1998. For cultic/ritual texts see e.g. Merkelbach 1968, 13–30; Quack 1997.

²⁰ See the common scholarly opinions about the so-called Demotic ‘nationalistic’ literature (Podemann Sørensen 1992, 168–70; Bowman 1986, 30–1; Frankfurter 1998, 242–8; Lloyd 1982, 37–55; Ray 1994, 63–6) and how they may have to be reconsidered (see Quack 2009a; Quack 2011b).

²¹ Manning 2010, 104–16; Montevecchi 1988, 441–2; Foraboschi 1988, especially 823–4; Łajtar 2012; Pestman 1995; cf. Clarysse 1995, especially 19; cf. Johnson 1986; on the role of language in ethnicity see Hall 1997, especially 177–81.

²² On this and all the following, Bowman 1986, 166–86; Bagnall 1993, 235–7, 240–1, 251; Frankfurter 1998, 14–15; also Hoffmann 2012, 557; Kákossy 1995a, especially 2898–931; Quack 2002; Verhoeven 2005; cf. Dunand 1979, 124–8.

INTRODUCTION

monumental temples in line with Egyptian tradition, and thus collaboration with the Egyptian priestly class became fundamental.²³ Similarly, many religious practices rooted in the Egyptian temples were preserved during the Graeco-Roman period: for example, the mummification and burial of sacred animals or the processions of local gods' images or bark shrines outside the temples (often with oracular purposes).²⁴ Leaving aside the great Egyptian temples, we can find both Greek and Egyptian shrines and cults displaying different degrees of 'syncretism'. For example, traditional festivals may have involved comedians and athletes on the Greek model, while at the same time the Greek element was often represented only by Greek equivalent names given to Egyptian gods (e.g. Zeus-Ammon), and typically Egyptian deities, such as the crocodile god Sobek, the hippopotamus Taweret and the dwarf Bes, were still venerated in the Roman period.²⁵ The range of cults and deities was vast, and anyone, regardless of their cultural background, could worship one or the other god without any difference, but in many cases the nature of the divinity, despite an added Greek name, remained faithful to its origin.²⁶

When a real fusion can be observed with certainty, it appears to have been motivated primarily by political reasons: that is the case with the pair Sarapis/Isis. Ptolemy I probably chose to promote the cult of the Memphite living Apis bull because it

²³ The temples depicted the foreign rulers, but the iconography, hieroglyphic writing and religious themes stuck to the Egyptian tradition. See Bagnall 1993, 48; Huzar 1988, 379–80; Manning 2010, especially 82–3, 90–6; Thompson 1994, 72–3; Clarysse 2009, 576; Minas-Nerpel 2012 (focusing on the Roman period); see also Milne 1928, 230.

²⁴ Frankfurter 1998, e.g. 38–9, 44, 153–7; Łajtar 2012, 180–1; Taylor 2001, 244–63; Kákosy 1995a, especially 2958–60, 3018–20; Clarysse 2009, 569–70; cf. **Concl.** pp. 338–9.

²⁵ Frankfurter 1998, 58, 98–9, 106–11, 121–31; Quaegebeur 1983; Pfeiffer 2005; Kaper 2005, 305–6; Whitehorne 1995; cf. Bernand 1969, 30–1; cf. Smelik and Hemelrijk 1984, 1863–9, 1879–905, 1955–81.

²⁶ Frankfurter 2012, 320–1; Kákosy 1995a, 2948–92; Whitehorne 1995, 3053, 3058–85; Dunand 1999.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

was theologically connected with kingship as the bearer of the divine office and, once deceased, it was identified with Osiris, the most popular Egyptian deity. The sovereign needed to convert the Egyptian religious and royal tradition into a form comprehensible to Greeks, thus *Wsr-Hp*, Osiris-Apis, was given the Hellenized Egyptian name Sarapis and a Greek iconography on the model of Zeus-Hades. Sarapis was needed to reinforce the image of royal power and give the king the possibility of being deified as living god, especially among non-Egyptians. However, despite this politically motivated syncretism, it seems that among the indigenous population Sarapis continued to be perceived just as an *interpretatio graeca* of Osiris.²⁷ Therefore, his connection with Isis was almost automatic. Isis was originally mainly a mother goddess in close connection with royalty, being the wife of Osiris, king of the gods, and the mother of Horus, who inherited his father's kingdom. She was also known to be a great magician – for example, she revived the dead Osiris and healed the poisoned, or otherwise sick, Horus – and was connected with the inundation of the Nile in her form of the star Sothis, Sirius, whose rising coincided with the beginning of the inundation. These characteristics, reinterpreted according to the occasion, made her easy to associate with the majority of female Mediterranean deities. For example, her connection with the inundation, and thus the produce of the earth, as well as her involvement in the revival of Osiris, the dead god, made her look like a chthonic deity of vegetation (e.g. Demeter/Ceres, Persephone/Proserpina, Cybele); her identification with Sirius, in connection with the

²⁷ Quack 2013, especially 237–8, 241–7; Pfeiffer 2008; Schmidt 2005; Hölbl, *LdÄ* 'Serapis'; Stambaugh 1972, especially 12–13, 41–4, 61–5; Dunand 1973b, 45–66; cf. Welles 1962; Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 1713–22; see also Borgeaud and Volokhine 2000; cf. Plu. *De Iside* 362b–d. On the establishment of the cult of Sarapis as Ptolemy's response to a public demand from Greeks already living in Egypt see Paarmann 2013, especially 275–8. In particular on Osiris-Apis, see Devauchelle 2010; Devauchelle 2012, stressing the predominance of Osiris and the minor role played by Apis in the 'birth' of Sarapis.

INTRODUCTION

rising of water, allowed her association with lunar goddesses (e.g. Selene/Luna, Artemis/Diana, Hecate); as queen of the gods she was Hera/Juno, as magician she was Hecate; in Egypt she was identified with Hathor, the cow, sky goddess of love, joy and music, but, since the *interpretatio graeca* equated Hathor with Aphrodite, Isis ended up absorbing the Greek goddess of love too. The strongly attractive power of Isis' cult made almost all the female Mediterranean deities susceptible to being used as different names for Isis 'the One'.²⁸ Nevertheless, since in the royal ideology of classical Egypt Isis represented the throne and cosmic protection of the king, the tendency to universalize this goddess as the counterpart of Sarapis seems to 'reflect the agenda of particular syncretistic constituencies more than religion "on the ground"'.²⁹ Despite their political promotion, Sarapis and Isis are the best example of the syncretistic trend of the period which coexisted with the persistence of indigenous traditions.

The Egyptian temples that had been fundamental for the preservation of this indigenous lore witnessed their final decline under Roman rule. Following the Egyptian programme of Augustus, the temples started to lose their economic independence in favour of the state, and their administration was centralized under a Roman official and kept under strict control by a complex bureaucratic system. The situation became even worse when, with the reform of Septimius Severus around AD 200, the temples were brought under the administration

²⁸ E.g. Vanderlip 1972, 1.14–24, 26; the famous passage in Apul. *Metam.* XI.2.5, cf. Griffiths 1975, 145–57; P. Oxy. 1380; Collart 1919; in general, Tran Tam Tinh, *LIMC* 'Isis', especially IV, 793–6; Witt 1971, especially 100–10, 123–51; Dunand 1973b, 1–26, 66–108; Leclant 1986; Merkelbach 1995, 51–3, 60–2, 94–8; cf. Bowman 1986, 176–8.

²⁹ Starting from Arsinoë II, sister-wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the king's consort was identified with Isis and the establishment of the dynastic cult was completed. On the whole subject see Frankfurter 1998, 101–6; Dunand 1973b, 27–66; also Žabkar 1988, 12–15, 89–90; Pfeiffer 2008, 394–6, 398–400; Van Oppen de Ruiter 2007, especially 101–6, 210–19, 512–16.

of local town councils and thus had to rely on the fluctuation of local economies.³⁰ With the gradual disappearance of the public structures that had always guaranteed the transmission of indigenous traditions, for the Egyptian lore to survive it had to shift from the public to the private sphere and to adapt as much as possible to the dominant cultural perspective, i.e. to Hellenize (cf. below pp. 18–19).³¹ This process is paralleled by the gradual disappearance of Demotic in the first century AD and the adoption of Greek even for traditional religious practices such as oracle questions.³²

In conclusion, Graeco-Roman Egypt was a society in which cultural overlaps and mutual influences were certainly possible, whether triggered by the availability of different cultural inputs (e.g. a learned Egyptian with Greek education) or imposed by the ruling class (e.g. the Hellenization of Osiris-Apis). However, in many cases it seems more correct to talk about cultural coexistence than cultural merging. At the same time, while using ‘Greek’ and ‘Egyptian’ to define ethnicity is at least hazardous, it is still possible to refer to ‘Greek’ and ‘Egyptian’ cultural backgrounds, and it should be specified that throughout this study, the use of these terms refers to different cultural backgrounds and does not necessarily imply ethnicity.

As far as the *PGM* are concerned, the complexity of their ritual details or the multiple appearance of identical formulae in different papyri tells us that the corpus had a long history of written transmission (see below pp. 22–3, point 3), which clearly points towards a literate upper class as far as the compilers of the spells are concerned. Since Demotic/Hieratic literacy, indigenous religious traditions and temple infrastructure were

³⁰ Lewis 1983, 91–3; Kákosy 1995a, 2898–948; Huzar 1988, 356, 371–2, 380–1; Geraci 1988, especially 409–11; Milne 1928, 230; Montevecchi 1988, 433, 449, 455; Vandorpe 2012, 263; but see also Klotz 2012b, especially 1–5.

³¹ Bagnall 1993, 261–8, 315; Bowman 1986, 179–80; Lewis 1983, 48–9; Frankfurter 1998, 27–30, 198–203, 221–4, 238–64; Frankfurter 2012, 321–2; Depauw 2012, 496; Łajtar 2012, 181. Cf. Zago 2010, 125–33.

³² See **Intro.** n.15; Naether 2010, 370–4; Buchholz 2013, especially 95–8.

INTRODUCTION

interconnected, the appearance of both these Egyptian scripts in the *PGM* allows us to locate this literate elite within the Egyptian priestly milieu which, though certainly Hellenized, remained also the hard core of Egyptian culture.³³ Whether these texts testify to an actual cultural fusion or only to cultural juxtaposition is the question this study tries to answer at least with reference to the nature of divinity displayed by a special subsection of the *PGM*, the so-called Greek magical hymns: metrical passages of variable length that constitute part of the praising section within some spells of the corpus.

‘Magical’ papyri and ‘magical’ hymns: notes on the features of a ‘genre’

In 1871 the publication of Taylor’s *Primitive Culture* marked the birth of ethnology as an independent science and, subsequently, of cultural anthropology. The development of these new disciplines posed the necessity of finding a broader definition for notions such as religion, science and magic in order to make them applicable to cultures other than Western civilization. After Frazer’s cultural evolutionism, which interpreted the magical approach as a ‘first stage’ typical of primitive societies, the scholarly trend tended to narrow the difference between magic and religion, considering them as contemporary answers to similar culture–nature interactions. Through the work of such scholars as Mauss, Durkheim, Malinowski and Pettazzoni³⁴ it became clear that ‘magic’ was hard to define in an unambiguous way, and the relativity of the concept started to

³³ Ritner 1995a, 3361; Depauw 1997, 41–3; Frankfurter 1998, 248–50; Frankfurter 1997.

³⁴ Especially J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*, whose second widened edition appeared in 1900; M. Mauss, ‘Esquisse d’une théorie générale de la magie’, *L’Année Sociologique*, 1902–3; É. Durkheim, *Les Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*, 1912; B. Malinowski, *A Scientific Theory of Culture*, 1944; R. Pettazzoni, the introduction to *L’onniscienza di Dio*, 1955.

be stressed: it seems it can be effectively defined only by contrast with its opposite (religion or science) and that the thin line dividing magic from religion varies according to the historical and socio-cultural context of the society we decide to analyse.³⁵

In spite of this long-standing debate, the subject is still controversial and it seems necessary to specify that in this study the terms 'magic' and 'magical' are used in a conventional way in relation to the procedures, conceptions, texts, images and objects that are normally classified under the category 'magic' in studies on the ancient world. The concept of 'magic' is not subjected here to any critical evaluation.³⁶ However, it may be

³⁵ See J. Middleton, 'Theories of magic', in 'Magic', in M. Eliade (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, New York 1987, IX, 82–9; also De Martino 1984; Wax and Wax 1963; Braarvig 1999; Tambiah 1990; Thomassen 1999; see also e.g. Van Baal 1963; Van Beek 1975; Versnel 1991.

³⁶ Given the controversy and ambiguity surrounding the concept of magic, the best solution in studies of this kind would seem either to ignore the subject (and just give bibliographical references) or to develop/choose a specific theory/definition for it. However, I believe this concern especially arose, as it usually happens, because magic became a quite 'fashionable' topic. As a matter of fact, it does not seem that lately defining e.g. 'religion' or 'science' is felt as a necessity as much as defining 'magic' (though they are hardly separable concepts, as shown by history of religions and cultural anthropology), so that the problem appears to be more factitious than real. Therefore, facing the impasse of 'ignoring magic' versus 'developing a theory of magic', I opted for a third solution: to give only a few pieces of information which are generally accepted in studies on the subject and, when mentioning more specific theories by specific scholars, to underline that they are only possible interpretations (for further details and in-depth analyses see the bibliography throughout this sub-chapter). In fact, first of all, I believe the nature of this study does not require either the selection and discussion of a pre-existent 'theory of magic' or the creation of a new one. This book focuses on the nature of divinity in the magical hymns according to its Greek/Egyptian cultural background and not on the definition of the concept of magic in the magical papyri or in Graeco-Roman Egypt. Nevertheless, instead of completely avoiding the subject, I decided to add this small introductory sub-chapter for the sake of the readers who are not acquainted with this material: it simply summarizes those characteristics of the magical papyri that induced modern scholars to label them as 'magical' and adds some generally accepted considerations about Western/Greek magic and especially Egyptian magic.

INTRODUCTION

worth spending a few words to summarize the reasons why the papyri under examination, and especially the hymns they contain, are called ‘magical’ by modern scholars (I shall focus on internal evidence).

Most importantly, the rituals prescribed by the magical papyri always take place in a private setting (such as the magician’s house), and are usually performed by the magician alone, in very few cases with the help of one assistant. This places them outside mainstream religion inasmuch as they are not directly connected with an official religious institution (such as a temple, a sanctuary, or a sacred site). Secondly, the papyri often appear as an amalgam of different religious traditions and, for example, the more traditional Greek deities are coupled or identified with Egyptian gods or Jewish angels, and are given secret names usually in the form of *voces magicae*.³⁷ Hence, as a general impression, the religious imagery of the papyri also seems to lie outside mainstream religion. Furthermore, it has been stressed how the rituals often imply the magician’s ability to change the course of nature and to coerce the will of gods, daimons, angels, or spirits of the dead (sometimes through blackmailing them), and how this power of compulsion would be perceived as impious from an orthodox religious point of view. Similarly impious would be the final goal of the rituals, since they often aim either at securing mundane privileges for the performer or at harming, deceiving or compelling someone else – though this is not always the case. Finally, the spells often describe themselves as ‘secret’ or recommend secrecy, which partly makes sense in

In the Conclusions to this study, the subject is briefly touched upon again within some remarks on the difference between the Greek and Egyptian conception of divinity, but even in this case the discussion just refers to a generally accepted feature of ancient magic.

³⁷ Brashear 1995, 3429–38, with rich bibliography: sequences of letters apparently without meaning but with a special sound or visual impact whose origin is often to be found in ‘foreign’ words or divine names. See also Mastrocinque 2003, 98–112; Addey 2011. Also Tardieu, Van den Kerchove and Zago 2013.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

opposition to an authority that forbids them, but at the same time it is also a contrivance to create their allure: they contain a secret knowledge not to be shared with everybody.³⁸

The same features apply to the magical papyri, first of all because they appear in the magical papyri, but also because they display some magical elements in themselves, which distinguish them from traditional Greek hymns. For example, they can incorporate *voces magicae* as secret names of the deities addressed or can identify the same deities with multiple foreign gods; their text can refer to the aim of the spell in which they are contained, such as to communicate with a dead person, or to send a demon to torment a woman until she surrenders to the performer's lust; they can also describe the magical procedure (such as blackmailing) or the ingredients used by the magician for that particular spell, and so on.

Last but not least, another fundamental characteristic of the papyri should be added to the list of the magical features, i.e. that these magical handbooks were often used by magicians (or better 'ritual specialists', see pp. 18–19, and 23–4 point 4) to perform/create *ad hoc* spells for their clientele, and thus to gain a profit.³⁹ While paying a tax, for example to consult an oracle institution (or nowadays leaving an offering when visiting a church), was probably perceived as fundamental for the maintenance of the sanctuary and its personnel, the earning of money by a private practitioner could have more often raised suspicion of charlatanism, and thus be connected with unorthodox magical practices.

In fact, though the above-listed magical features are based on the standard 'Western' concept of magic, they do not differ

³⁸ For the 'magical' features of the papyri see Brashear 1995, 3390–5; Ritner 1995a, especially 3347–53; cf. Dickie 2001, 26, 38–40 (especially on the secretive nature of magic), 42–3, 46. Cf. also Johnston 2010a, for the relation between men and gods in divinatory spells; Quack 2002, especially 43.

³⁹ On this and many of the previously mentioned characteristics of the papyri see Quack 2010a; also Quack 2011c, 143–4; specifically in Greece, Johnston 2008, 177–9.

INTRODUCTION

very much from the attitudes that could be labelled as magical in fifth-century BC Greece.⁴⁰ As in many other times and cultures, it seems that ‘magic’/‘magical’ was usually ‘a third-person attribution rather than a first-person self-designation’.⁴¹ It was a sort of ‘derogatory label’ given to practices or beliefs that, though perhaps once perceived as religious, acquired a nuance of illicitness owing to changed socio-cultural views, to a shift from public to private, or to their association with a specific group of people. The clearest example is the Greek tendency to designate foreign ritual practices as magic, which somehow corresponds to the attribute ‘magical’ given to the mixture of multicultural deities and names in the magical papyri: the definition of religious orthodoxy is achieved by contrast with the religious world of the potentially dangerous and hostile barbarians.⁴² At the same time, this self-definitional stigmatization could occur within Greek culture itself, for

⁴⁰ Various reasons have been proposed for the emergence of the notion of magic in fifth-century BC Greece. For example, in a very interesting analysis, Dickie (2001, 18–46) suggests that it was a spontaneous phenomenon originally in connection with specific practices or groups of people perceived as illicit or impious, and underlines the fluidity of the notion itself. On the other hand, Graf (1995; Graf 1997a; Graf 1997b, especially 109–14), stressing how in Homer the use of poisons/potions, incantations and necromancy had no negative connotation in itself, connects the shaping of the notion of magic to the fifth-century BC development of philosophical theology and medical science: philosophers began to challenge the idea that communication between men and gods was possible, and physicians made clear how diseases and illnesses had no supernatural causes. The final result was to ‘stress the separation between the world of nature (humans included) and the divine realm’ (Graf 1995, 40; also Braarvig 1999, 37–40; Ankarloo and Clark 1999, 244–52) and to foster the rise of magic as an autonomous category. Whatever the case, the concept of magic remained ambiguous since it was often liable to variation according to the point of view: see e.g. Graf 2011; Johnston 2008, 145–53. See also Phillips 1991; Versnel 1991; Smith 1995; Ritner 1995b, 43–8.

⁴¹ Smith 1995, 18.

⁴² A common example can be seen in the evolution of the word *magos*, originally just a Persian religious specialist: see Nock 1972a; see also Hall 1989, especially 143–54; Hartog 1988; Hall 1997; Ogden 2001, 128–48; Cartledge 2002; Dieleman 2005, 239–54; Asirvatham, Pache and Watrous 2001, xiv–xvi.

example as shown by the famous example of Plato attacking the sorcerers of his time:

Beggar priests and prophets go to the doors of the rich and persuade them that they have the power ... to cure any wrong ... and that they will harm an enemy, a just man or an unjust man alike, for a small fee ... since they persuade the gods ... to serve them by certain charms and bindings.

... those who ... charm the souls of many of the living by alleging that they charm the souls of the dead. They undertake to persuade the gods through the practice of sorceries with sacrifices and prayers and spells and try to destroy ... entire houses for the sake of money.⁴³

It would seem from these passages that, given the above-mentioned characteristics, Plato would not have had any problem in calling the magical papyri 'magical'.⁴⁴

On the contrary, the same could have hardly happened in Pharaonic Egypt. As Ritner⁴⁵ thoroughly explained, the native equivalent term for magic, *ḥkꜣ*, did not have any negative or unorthodox connotation in itself, but referred to a sort of creative *logos* emanating from the creator god and personified

⁴³ Plato, *Resp.* 364b–e, *Lg.* 909a–d; cf. Ogden 2002, 20–3; **Concl.** n.127. See also Johnston 2008, 109–43.

⁴⁴ Nevertheless, see Johnston 2008, 144–79, especially 146–7, underlining that 'magic' is often very similar to mainstream religion and that the differences are just in details. On the whole subject of Graeco-Roman magic see also e.g. the select bibliography in the first volume of *MHNH* and especially Segal 1981; Deubner 1982, 275–98; Faraone and Obbink 1991 (with rich bibliography); Remus 1982; MeMi; Schäfer and Kippenberg 1997; Jordan, Montgomery and Thomassen 1999; MiMe (in particular Hoffman, 179–94, and Frankfurter, 159–78); Bremmer 1999; Noegel, Walker and Wheeler 2003; Ciruolo and Seidel 2002; Dickie 2001; Kákossy 1995a, 3023–8.

⁴⁵ On this and all the following, Ritner 1993, 4–28, 217–20, 236–49; Ritner 1995a, 3353–5; Ritner 1995b; Borghouts 1987; also Te Velde 1969–70; Koenig 2013; cf. Quack 2002. Dickie 2001, 22, suggests that it may be impossible to find the notion of magic in the conceptual system of the Ancient Egyptians since it is not certain that Heka (see below) was 'the personification of what we would call magic' (in the 'Western' sense of a 'hidden, illicit force'). See also Lloyd 2011, especially 99–105.

INTRODUCTION

in its turn as a god, Heka. This deity embodied the performative force through which the transition from ideal (speech) to actual creation (matter) is achieved, the force connecting the abstract with the tangible, the divine with the human/natural world. The nature of *ḥkꜣ*, a word that can be connected with the idea of ‘consecrating imagery’ thanks to a phonetic pun, underlies the “‘imagistic” nature of the magical process’ thanks to which, for example, ‘the king’s ritual presentation of food, diadems and prisoners is a *reflection* of the god’s granting of life, prosperity and victory’ and the king himself is the ‘living image’ of the god.⁴⁶ This sort of sympathetic link was fundamental in the creative process and thus inherent in all cosmos and ethically ‘neutral’ in itself. Even hostile magic, such as cursing, was an integral part of the daily temple rituals, and ‘magicians’ were not foreigners or members of a special category employing alternative methods in comparison with a given set of religious practices, but rather temple priests, representatives of official religious values, who had access to the sacred books of the temples.⁴⁷

This kind of attitude towards magic contrasted with Greek and even more with Roman views (since they were particularly concerned with the subversive power of foreign religions),⁴⁸ and thus had to suffer from the cultural clash of Greek and then Roman domination. In parallel with the decline of the temple institution, the traditional Egyptian *ḥkꜣ*⁴⁹ was forced to shift from the openness of public religion to the privateness of ‘magic’, acquiring a shade of unorthodoxy from the Roman cultural perspective. With the progressive weakening of the

⁴⁶ The quotations are from Ritner 1995b, 50; cf. Eaton 2013, 5–8, 11.

⁴⁷ E.g. Gardiner 1917; Frankfurter 1997; Frankfurter 1998, 198–203; Quack 2002; Kákósy 1995a, 3025; Dieleman 2005, 203–54; cf. Dunand 1979, 124–5.

⁴⁸ See Smelik and Hemelrijk 1984; Graf 1997b, 102–9; Kippenberg 1997; Ankarloo and Clark 1999, 253–66. Cf. Zago 2010, 115–25.

⁴⁹ On Egyptian magic see also e.g. Ritner 1989; Koenig 1994; Koenig 2002; Assmann 1997b; Szpakowska 2006; Roccati and Siliotti 1987; cf. Borghouts 1978.

temple influence and legitimization, professional priests started to operate more and more at a local level as ritual experts shifting from official clergymen to unsanctioned ‘magicians’. As Frankfurter suggested,⁵⁰ the composition of the *PGM* may be considered as part of the complex process of ‘adaptation’ mentioned above (see p. 11) that was triggered by socio-economic reasons and carried out by the Egyptian priestly ‘upper class’ which, in order to preserve its prestige and religious heritage, had to promote traditional beliefs and rituals by re-adapting them according to the expectations of the Hellenized ruling class. Thus, the transition from Egyptian religious traditions to Graeco-Egyptian magic could represent not only the underground displacement of Egyptian public religion triggered by the Roman cultural perspective, but also the priests’ attempt to conform to the stereotyped idea that their Hellenized rulers had of them,⁵¹ or at least to ‘translate’ their traditional beliefs (and integrate them with the Greek ones) in order to make them more comprehensible and appealing to the new mixed readership and clientele.

PGM AND PDM

The climate of interdisciplinary debate around Graeco-Egyptian magical literature during the last decades of the twentieth century succeeded in establishing some basic characteristics of the *PGM* and the *PDM*. As already mentioned, in spite of the accidental formal division between the two corpora, it is generally accepted that they should be considered as one. In fact, in the majority of cases the two languages appear on the

⁵⁰ Frankfurter 1998, 198–237; Frankfurter 1997; Frankfurter 2000; Frankfurter 2012; also Kákossy 1995a, 3025–35.

⁵¹ Also Dieleman 2005, 1–10; Dieleman 2012, 338–42; Schwendner 2002; Clarysse 2009, 584; cf. Klotz 2012a. On ‘transmythological redundancy’ as the characteristic of traditional Egyptian magical literature which allowed foreign mythological motives to be easily accommodated see Podemann Sørensen 1992, 174–80.

INTRODUCTION

same papyrus (often written by the same hand) so that some texts included in the *PDM* are nothing but sections of a corresponding *PGM* or vice versa.

For the identification of the different papyri, the system of numbering introduced by Preisendanz and continued by Betz will be used for both the *PGM* and the *PDM* (Roman numerals).⁵² For the sake of convenience, when the Greek documents are referred to the acronym will be omitted, while it will be kept for the Demotic ones. The documents published in *Supplementum Magicum* will be identified according to the system of numbering used in that edition (*Suppl.* plus Arabic numerals).

The contents of the corpora can be divided into two main categories: handbooks and applied spells. The handbooks could be included among literary texts (though they are preferably considered as a separate category together with the rest of the corpus) since they are collections of spells, a sort of recipe books, to be consulted when needed. The magical procedures described normally include a ritual section, an invocational one and a list of ingredients (not necessarily in this order or clearly separated from each other). The majority of spells require the writing of formulae or symbols on a sheet of papyrus or metal tablets, etc. These pieces of formularies, often provided with the personal names of the parties involved, attest the actual use of a specific spell by a specific person: they are the documentary pendant to the handbooks, constituting the 'applied magic'.

Most papyri are dated between the second and fifth centuries AD. Some of the longest handbooks are part of the so-called Theban Magical Library, as they were found together, allegedly in a tomb, in or around Thebes.⁵³ The provenance

⁵² Preisendanz: from I to LXXXI. Betz: from LXXXII to CXXX. As far as the *PDM* are concerned, the system of numbering adopted by Betz is to be preferred even if the volume is not a critical edition.

⁵³ For earlier or later examples, the criteria and the precise dating of the papyri, see Brashear 1995, 3419–20, 3491–3. On the issue of the 'library' being a private collection, or belonging to a temple library see Tait 1995, especially 173–4; cf. **Intro.** n.1.

of the other papyri is mostly unknown.⁵⁴ Apart from Greek and Demotic, Hieratic and Coptic are used for short passages or glosses. Though the two corpora are substantially different in extent (almost 200 papyri for the *PGM*⁵⁵ against five for the *PDM*⁵⁶), it also is possible to identify, apart from common characteristics, some differences:

1. Though in the past the *PGM* corpus tended to be considered as an amalgam including various religious traditions (Mithraic, Babylonian, Christian, Gnostic, Persian and especially Jewish), it has become clear that this notion has to be reappraised. 'Foreign' elements are certainly present, but they consist mainly of divine names and *voces magicae*⁵⁷ often used as alternative and/or secret names of the gods

⁵⁴ See **Intro.** n.1. Definitely part of the 'Library' were IV, V, Va, XII (*PDM* xii), XIII, XIV (*PDM* xiv), while for I, II, III, VII, LXI (*PDM* lxi) and *PDM* Suppl. the same provenance is possible but not certain: Brashear 1995, 3402–4. For VII as not part of the 'Library', see Gordon, forthcoming.

⁵⁵ Considering only those in the publications by Preisendanz, Betz and Daniel and Maltomini that form the standardized corpus; for the recent editions of other material see Brashear 1995, 3478–84.

⁵⁶ These are the four handbooks included in Betz (see **Intro.** n.5) plus a fifth fragment of handbook (P. BM 10808), for which see Dieleman 2004; Sederholm 2006 (though problematic, see Quack 2009b); cf. Crum 1941; Quack 2004, 428 and footnote 10. Ritner 1995a, 3343–5, adds also a tablet and an ostrakon plus a few other papyri (from the 'Faiyum Temple Archive': Reymond 1977), but they can hardly be considered magical, see Quack 1998, footnote 2. The count of the Demotic texts is still to be enlarged by a number of unpublished sources, which anyway will not change the respective order of magnitude very much, but are important for the historical development of the genre: e.g. P. Brooklyn 47.218.47 v. (mostly in Hieratic script but linguistically early Demotic) and P. Heidelberg Dem. 5 (Professor J. F. Quack is working on the publication of both texts), which contain invocations to Imhotep to obtain visions, possibly in dreams. More interestingly, it should be noted that the Demotic texts are earlier in date (the latest ones date from the first half of the third century) compared to many of the Greek ones (which can date also to the fourth/fifth centuries). Cf. Ritner 1995a, 3334, on the subject and on the controversial issue about what can and what cannot be classified as 'magical'.

⁵⁷ See **Intro.** n.37.

INTRODUCTION

invoked. The cases in which a ‘foreign’ influence could be possible at a conceptual, ritual or formulaic level are rare and still under debate.⁵⁸ Thus, the main components of the corpus remain the Greek and Egyptian ones. On the other hand, the ‘foreign’ elements in the *PDM* are reduced to a minimum: though sometimes they can appear in *voces magicae* or in allusions to, for example, Jewish tradition, in many other cases they are non-existent, so that these texts can be defined as mainly Egyptian in nature.

2. Many of the procedures, rituals, formulaic structures and conceptions of divinity attested in the corpus can be traced back to Egyptian religious tradition. These include the possibility of threatening the gods and forcing them to act in a specific way, the use of ‘pure boys’ as mediums in oracular procedures, the magician’s ability to identify himself with divine entities, the use of *voces magicae*, the power attributed to the knowledge of the ‘true’ secret divine name, etc.⁵⁹
3. The longest applied spells seem to have been compiled by consulting the handbooks and copying from them. At the same time, the handbooks are not original compositions, but the result of a long process of collection and re-elaboration of earlier material. This is clearly shown, for example, by the direct quotation of previous sources, the recording of multiple variants for a single spell or magical formula, scribal or translation mistakes, and by the fact that portions of text clearly deriving from the same source are found in different papyri. This specific textual history, also

⁵⁸ For the ‘foreign’ elements in the *PGM*, Brashear 1995, 3422–9, with rich bibliography; cf. Riess 1935; in the *PDM*, Ritner 1995a, 3351–2.

⁵⁹ E.g. Brashear 1995, 3390–5; Kákosy 1995a, 3028–43; Sauneron 1951; Ritner 1995a, 3345–55, 3362–71; Ritner 1993, in particular 112–19, 157–9, 193–9; Koenig 1994, 60–72, 156–65; Quack 2011d; on the power of names as typical of post-classical syncretism see Pulleyn 1994, especially 23–5.

fostered by the conservative attitude of magic,⁶⁰ creates some dating problems, not for the extant papyri, but for their sources or the sources of their sources. Generally, these can almost always be placed at least one century earlier in comparison with the dating of the papyri. Moreover, among the unpublished Demotic texts there are manuals e.g. from the Saitic or Ptolemaic periods, and the oldest Greek handbooks date as far back as the first century BC/AD.⁶¹ They are quite exceptional cases, but their existence might still suggest that this was the period in which the Greek manuals began to circulate, to be copied and modified until they reached the stage attested by the later papyri.

4. As outlined above (see pp. 11–12 and 19), a considerable part of the compilation process of the handbooks, if not all of it, must have been carried out within the Egyptian priestly milieu, i.e. by ritual experts who had, or had had at a certain stage, access to temple libraries and were trained in the Egyptian scripts. Considering the dearth of magical handbooks in the papyrus findings from temple libraries such as Tebtunis or Soknopaiou Nesos,⁶² these ritual experts were

⁶⁰ On textual history see e.g. Brashear 1995, 3414–16; Dieleman 2011; a detailed analysis of the bilingual *PGM XII/PDM xii* and *PDM xiv/PGM XIV* in Dieleman 2005, especially 47–101. A tendency to conservatism is inherent in magic: the effectiveness of the spell depends on how precisely the rituals and formulae are performed and recited, and thus the room for changes is quite limited (Kákosy 1995a, 3044–8). Nevertheless, the ritual specialist could for example add further instructions, formulae (and maybe modify them), or change an ingredient, as demonstrated by the many versions of basically similar spells or by the explicit recording of textual variants of the same spell or formula. But at the same time the very existence of these versions and variants testifies to a continuity in the spells' structure and formulae, exactly as for example the many parallels of the same invocations found in different papyri. For the possibility of documenting change see e.g. Bohak 2008, 146–8; Quack 2010a, 47–51. For conservativeness in Egyptian literature see Parkinson 2002, 33, 50–3.

⁶¹ E.g. XX, *Suppl.* 71, 72; P. Oxy. 4468. See LiDonnici 2003.

⁶² See e.g. Ryholt 2005; Quack 2002, 57–9. Nevertheless, it is possible to find handbooks with instructions for treating ailments and preparing amulets;

INTRODUCTION

probably off-duty priests in search of additional income to whom a person in need of a spell could turn.⁶³ Therefore, the use of Greek as the main language of the corpus cannot be considered significant in the attribution of these compositions to a specific cultural environment, not even for those papyri that have Greek as their only language. For example, *PGM V* was part of the same ‘Theban Magical Library’ that brought to light the two longest *PDM*,⁶⁴ and thus it should belong to the same priestly milieu.⁶⁵

Given these fundamental characteristics of Graeco-Egyptian magical texts, some conclusions that form the basis of the present study have to be drawn. First, the method of composition of these texts, together with their conservative attitude, allows us to search for possible sources or parallels within both Greek and Egyptian material. This is true not only from a philological point of view, but also from a conceptual one. For example, in some cases it is possible to trace formulaic expressions and ritual procedures, as well as religious conceptions, back to the Middle Kingdom or earlier.

Second, even if the handbooks were compiled within an Egyptian priestly milieu, this does not mean that, among the sources that were used, there could not have been texts originally composed in a Greek cultural environment. Even in this case, the use of Egyptian sources would not be a matter of debate, as Egyptian influence is predominant in the Greek texts too (point 2), but perhaps the production environment of this supposed Greek material could be other than the temple

on this and on the compilers of the magical papyri and their connection with the temple scriptorium see Dieleman 2011.

⁶³ See **Intro.** n.39; Quack 1998, especially 85, 89.

⁶⁴ *PDM* xii and xiv.

⁶⁵ Not to mention that, if I, II, III, VII, LXI (*PDM* lxi) and *PDM* Suppl. could be ascribed to the same find with certainty (cf. **Intro.** n.54), it would mean that all the longest preserved handbooks derive from the same Egyptian priestly milieu.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

library.⁶⁶ Even if we decide to exclude this hypothesis, the differences between the *PGM* and the *PDM* demonstrate that for the compilers of the handbooks, often proficient in Greek and Demotic, the use of one or the other language was not just a matter of caprice. The scarcity of ‘foreign’ elements in the *PDM*, starting from the supremacy of the national pantheon, indicates that these texts were meant to be used by Egyptians, exactly as the ‘seclusive’ nature of the language employed already suggests. On the contrary, the abundant presence of the Greek pantheon in the *PGM*, together with a variety of ‘foreign’ elements, demonstrates that whoever wrote them had a specific group of users in mind: Hellenized ritual specialists and their clients (cf. above p. 19). Sometimes I will use the word ‘audience’ for the sake of convenience, but with inverted commas to mark that for these texts it is not possible to talk about a group of people actually witnessing their enactment, but about the group of users at whom they were targeted, which includes both the ritual specialists working with the handbooks and their clientele with possibly no first-hand experience of the texts.

In conclusion, even if we accept that the only compilers of the handbooks were ritual experts with a priestly Egyptian background, the study of the *PGM* can still be significant not only for the Egyptian but also for the Greek contribution to the magico-religious thought of the Graeco-Roman period. As the *PGM* had to appeal to Hellenized specialists and clients, whoever wrote them must have referred to the Greek tradition whenever the context allowed, whether consulting ‘originally’ Greek written sources or not.

PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

This study aims at investigating the nature of the most representative deities of a special subsection of the *PGM*: the magical

⁶⁶ Cf. Dieleman 2005. In general, on the opposite trend (adoption of Egyptian ideas by Greek writers) cf. Stephens 2003, especially 5–16, 249–57.

INTRODUCTION

hymns. The analysis will attempt to address the question: how 'Greek' and how 'Egyptian' are they? The final goal is to establish what divine features can be ascribed to a Greek or Egyptian background, and thus to try to understand whether the nature of divinity described by the magical hymns displays actual evidence of mutual religious influence or not. With the syncretistic trend starting in the Hellenistic period, the supra-national development of divinity often transformed the traditional gods into new entities. However, it is also true that most distinguishing features (epithets, areas of competence, mythologies, etc.) are still traceable to the specific deities in their original cultural environment.⁶⁷ So, the question remains: are the gods of the magical hymns Greek or Egyptian in nature? Can they still be traced back to one or the other religious tradition? And thus, were the magical hymns originally composed in a Greek or Egyptian cultural background? The magical hymns can be further investigated in their connection with the *PGM*: can the treatment of divinity in the magical hymns tell us something about the cultural background of the compilers of the *PGM*? Why were some Greek or Egyptian divine features preserved and others not? Are these reasons strictly related to the appearance of these gods in a magical context? Can they tell us anything about the religious plurality and/or fusion of the two cultures?

The magical hymns have been chosen because they are 'pure' invocations, i.e. they are usually not interrupted by long digressions about ritual procedures, which makes them highly suitable for conveying the greatest number of details about the nature of divinity in the minimum space. Furthermore, they have always been considered the most 'authentically Greek' component of the corpus because of their metrical nature and the appearance of deities, epithets and mythological references

⁶⁷ E.g. Grandjean 1975, for an example of this methodological approach applied to an Isis aretology. Cf. Quaegebeur 1983.

belonging specifically to Greek tradition.⁶⁸ Since most early misconceptions about the *PGM* derived from having given too much importance to the Greek cultural background, it seemed intriguing to analyse what was thought to be the most probable Greek contribution to the corpus. At the same time, the magical hymns represent our best chance to locate ‘originally’ Greek elements or textual parallels within the *PGM*.

Every line of the magical hymns will be analysed, even if it does not contain any direct reference to the god addressed. As this investigation is text based, the contextual information can be equally important for determining a Greek or Egyptian background. For example, the recurrence of particular rituals in connection with particular gods will help to illuminate the original areas of competence of the deities in question in connection with their Greek or Egyptian background. Similarly, whenever relevant, the stylistic structure and specific rhetorical features of the hymns will be examined in connection with the content they express. In fact, in view of the compilatory method of composition of the *PGM*, the style of the hymns could convey as much information about their origin as their content.

The methodology adopted consists in analysing the hymns in the light of earlier Greek and Egyptian sources and religious-magical traditions in order to find possible textual or conceptual parallels. In this way it will be possible to define what can be considered ‘originally Greek’ or ‘Egyptian’, meaning:

- attested in Greek territories in an autochthonous cultural context and at the same time not attested in Egypt – and vice versa;

⁶⁸ Brashear 1995, 3420–2. They also seem to be typical of Greek texts, being unparalleled in the *PDM*. However, considering that Pharaonic magical literature often employs hymnic invocations (e.g. the Harris magical papyrus, Leitz 1999, 31–50), this impression could be due to our scant knowledge of the Egyptian metrical system.

INTRODUCTION

- and/or showing a continuity within an ascertained Greek or Egyptian cultural tradition which is attested in the Graeco-Roman period and, preferably, traceable to an earlier date.
- Even if the focus will be kept on the Greek and Egyptian components, whenever ‘foreign’ elements appear, they will be acknowledged and briefly discussed.

MAGICAL HYMNS

History of studies

As already mentioned, the magical hymns have always been thought to be the relics of an originally Greek literary production. Thus, dealing with these metrical sections (mainly hexametrical), the early scholars’ approach was to try to restore an *Urfassung*, an archetype, eliminating non-metrical portions and *voces magicae* (considered as later interpolations) and adjusting the text preserved for the sake of correct prosody. The clearest example of this tendency can be seen in Preisendanz’s edition, where thirty reconstructed hymns were published at the end of the second volume.⁶⁹ Although they proved useful for scholars, they were rather misleading, exactly like the decision to omit the Demotic sections in bilingual papyri. These choices fostered the illusion of dealing mainly with originally Greek material and somehow prevented the awakening of Egyptologists’ interest for a long time.

The development in the studies on the *PGM* made clear how the attempts to restore an *Urfassung* were almost useless. Heitsch thought that the great popularity of these hymns and their continuous adaptation to different contexts were the basic reasons why it is now impossible to reconstruct their ‘pre-magical originals’;⁷⁰ nonetheless, the main problem lies in the impossibility of being sure of our restoration hypotheses. These

⁶⁹ In the revised edition of 1973–4.

⁷⁰ Heitsch 1959, 220.

hymns could have existed as separate compositions at an early stage, but this is hard to prove, since they remain unparalleled outside the *PGM*. The evident risk in any attempt at restoration is of obtaining a text that never existed. At this stage, the prevalent idea is, quoting Brashear, ‘that while some hymns were probably composed in magic circles for the use of the conjuror, others might in fact descend from ancient Greek literary endeavour’, and that ‘the hymns obviously include much that could be traced back to ancient Greek precedents if only we had the means necessary for comparing them’.⁷¹

While renouncing attempts at reconstruction, we can still search for parallels and possible sources, especially because there is general agreement that the magical hymns represent a later copying stage of texts that date from the first/second century AD, which, in their turn, could have been composed through reworking earlier material.⁷² The clearest evidence of this process is the appearance of sections of the same hymn within different papyri.⁷³ Another feature, which may shed light on the composition of the hymns, is the presence of Homeric verses, perfectly fitted into the new context. Though Homeric verses are certainly an originally Greek element, their appearance does not guarantee a Greek background either for the whole hymn or for the nature of the deity addressed, since Homeric texts were very popular and much copied in Graeco-Roman Egypt and widespread even within magical literature.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Brashear 1995, 3420–1; Nock 1929, 222; Furley 1995, 39–40.

⁷² Nock 1929, 223–8.

⁷³ E.g. the hymn to Hermes, preserved in three different papyri of different dates: fourth, third and second/third centuries AD (V 401–20, VII 668–80, XVIIIb). Though the earliest text presents some variants, it is clearly an older version of the later ones: during almost three centuries, not much had changed.

⁷⁴ The best examples are the so-called *Homeromanteia* (cf. VII 1–148, Maltomini 1995), lists of Homeric verses employed for oracular purposes, but Homeric verses are used as magical formulae also in spells; Schwendner 2002; Collins 2008a, 104–31; Collins 2008b; Naether 2010, 330–1; Karanika 2011; Faraone 1996, especially 83–5.; cf. also Faraone 2006.

INTRODUCTION

However, the insertion of Homeric verses is significant for understanding the composition process and its background: either the compiler knew Homer by heart (which usually implies a ‘Greek’ education, see **Intro** n.12) or, having to choose a specific verse for a specific context, he consulted a Homeric text, or at least a list of Homeric verses (which implies the availability of these sources and thus points again to a temple library connection). In conclusion, even if it is probably true that most magical hymns were composed in magical circles, this does not mean we cannot still try to trace back their precedents and cultural background thanks, especially, to the particular textual history of the *PGM*.

A different approach adopted by studies in magical hymns tried to distinguish between Greek and oriental/Egyptian contributions. In fact, in these metrical sections, as in the rest of the corpus, it is possible to find references we cannot explain by referring to a classical Greek background, for example the solar god addressed as *κάνθαρος*, ‘scarab’.⁷⁵ Following the path opened by Norden,⁷⁶ Riesenfeld⁷⁷ took into consideration the differences in the stylistic structure of the Greek and Near Eastern hymns, and tried to explain some divine aspects in the light of Egyptian tradition. For example, using an epithet such as *ἀεροειδής* (‘airlike’) for the solar god would be justified by the existence of a close relationship between the sun, the air and the wind in Egyptian religious thought. Riesenfeld noticed how introductory formulae such as *χαῖρε* (‘hail’), *ἴλαθι* (‘be propitious’), or *κλῦθι* (‘listen’) would be typical of Greek hymnography, while an equivalent such as *σὲ καλέω* (‘I call to you/ invoke’) would be typical of the ‘oriental’ hymnic style. Similarly, the use of compound epithets and their accumulation would be typical of the Greek hymn,⁷⁸ while the ‘oriental’ hymn would use, for the same purpose, substantival participles,

⁷⁵ E.g. III 207–8, IV 943.

⁷⁶ Norden 1956.

⁷⁷ Riesenfeld 1946.

⁷⁸ See Morand 2001, 68–75.

relative clauses, or simple adjectives followed by a complement. For example, an attribute such as ὁ μέγας ἐν οὐρανῷ ('the mighty in the sky') would follow the oriental pattern, while an attribute such as χρυσοφαής ('aglow like gold') would follow the Greek. These considerations may be interesting if we are trying to discover the ethnic origin of the authors, as they provide information on how the writer's mentality was linguistically structured. Nevertheless, as both stylistic patterns can appear inside the same hymn, the only possible conclusion is that we are dealing with both Greek and Egyptian rhetorical models. Furthermore, if we employ this approach to understanding whether Greek or Egyptian sources were used during the composition process, the outcome risks being unsatisfactory. Even if we admit that a phrase such as ὁ μέγας ἐν οὐρανῷ follows an Egyptian stylistic pattern, there is nothing that prevents it from being completely Greek. At the same time, a language like Greek, which frequently employs compound epithets, could have chosen this rhetorical contrivance in order to render an 'Egyptian' phrase expressed with relative clause or adjective and complement. This kind of stylistic approach, whether involving linguistic or structural features, becomes really significant only when it focuses both on formal and conceptual peculiarities.⁷⁹ In this case it becomes possible to distinguish between instances in which the language copies a 'foreign' pattern but conveys traditional ideas and instances in which the 'foreign' pattern embodies concepts alien to Greek tradition.

This kind of stylistic-conceptual approach underlies the remarks of Ritner who, insisting on the importance of Egyptian sources and cultural background for the understanding of the *PGM*, favoured the hypothesis that the Egyptian priests themselves could have composed the hymns (as probably all

⁷⁹ For a focus on the Greek or Egyptian origin of the conception of divinity conveyed by the hymns see MT.

INTRODUCTION

the handbooks). In support of this theory, he showed how the hymns of the so-called slander spells⁸⁰ have Egyptian parallels in late Pharaonic rituals attributing sacrilege to demons or personal enemies, and in Egyptian magical literature from the Pyramid Texts onwards.⁸¹ At a conceptual level, the 'ritual blame shifting' did not exist in classical Greek tradition, while it was quite common in the Egyptian; the situation is the same, at a rhetorical level, for the model phrase 'NN said/did it, not I'; finally, there are Egyptian parallels in poetic and magical contexts. Apart from hymns, Ritner also underlined how some strange Greek expressions can be explained if we understand them as translations from the Egyptian. One of the most significant examples is the term *μυστήριον*: it seemed to refer to an exclusively Greek tradition and, therefore, suggested that the theology of mystery cults had a part in the *PGM*. Nevertheless, as Ritner pointed out, 'while the *PGM* uses *μυστήριον* the contemporary Demotic spells retain the native equivalent *ššṯ*' ('secret', 'mystery') which has always been used in Egyptian literature simply to designate magical rites and spells'.⁸² This compound approach, taking into consideration style, language and religious-magical traditions at the same time, is the one I will try to follow in analysing the magical hymns. They will be examined line by line and overall, in order to find out which conceptual, stylistic, linguistic and ritual features can be ascribed to a Greek background and which to an Egyptian one.

Background of the magical hymns

As Brashear has stressed,⁸³ the difficulty in understanding the transmission of the magical hymns consists in the lack of means for comparing them with ancient Greek precedents,

⁸⁰ Here hymn 13.

⁸¹ Ritner 1995a, 3368–71; Quack 1996, 331–2.

⁸² Ritner 1995a, 3363–8, *versus* Betz 1991.

⁸³ Above p. 29.

and the real problem may be our scant knowledge of the Greek hymns used in cultic/ritual contexts. They were often not recorded in inscriptions, or possibly were transmitted orally, and thus it is very difficult to trace their textual history. Furthermore, the surviving corpora of hymns are not particularly helpful since it is not certain whether they were used in ritual or were literary compositions meant for different contexts (*Homeric Hymns*, Callimachus' *Hymns*). The *Orphic Hymns* (*OH*) may represent an exception since the corpus seems to have been a sort of 'prayer book' used by an Orphic community, but it could also be the expression of a very specific religious reality.⁸⁴ The similarities between magical hymns and *OH* have often been pointed out, but they are mainly stylistic in kind: there is a general impression of formal unity, which suggests that these texts should date back to the same period (first/second century AD), but not even one entire verse is actually paralleled.⁸⁵

Despite the scarcity of extant Greek cultic/ritual hymns, there are examples that suggest they could be quite popular and spread widely, possibly through the circulation of copies written on papyrus. Such is the case of the Paean to Apollo-Asclepius, inscribed copies of which have been found in Athens (second century AD), Ionia (fourth century BC), Macedonia (second century AD) and Ptolemais in Egypt (AD 97).⁸⁶ The differences in date also suggest that these texts, like other hymns, could be highly conservative and the availability of written copies of Paeans like this in Egypt might underlie the

⁸⁴ Furley 1995, 29–30; Furley and Bremer 2001, I.5–7, 13–14, 41–50; Aloni 1980; Bulloch 1984; cf. Klinghardt 1999, especially 6–11; on the cultic role of the *OH* see Dieterich 1911, 101–10; Ricciardelli 2000, xxxiv–xxxvii; Morand 2001, 80; Guthrie 1993, 257–8.

⁸⁵ Kern 1910; Kern 1911; cf. Dilthey 1872; Dieterich 1911, 101–10; Rudhardt 2008, 166–7; Ricciardelli 2000, xxviii–xxx; Morand 2001, 86–8.

⁸⁶ *IG* 2.4509; *SEG* 4.626; *SEG* 3.497; Bernand 1969, 652, no. 176 and commentary; cf. *SEG* 51.2170 *bis*; Oliver 1936, 114–18; Klinghardt 1999, 8–10; Rutherford 2001b.

INTRODUCTION

appearance of the epithet Paian in one of the hymns to Mandulis from the temple of Kalabchah (Talmis) or in the magical hymns of the *PGM*.⁸⁷ Similarly, in one case we can find in the magical hymns an Apollo Paian who ‘dwells in Colophon’. The epithet refers to Apollo Clarius, who had a famous oracle in the village of Claros in the territory of Colophon, Ionia.⁸⁸ Such a precise reference could suggest the influence of the hexametrical oracles of Apollo Clarius, preserved mainly epigraphically or in quotations by ancient authors. In fact, some of these oracles present similarities with the magical hymns: there are mentions of Iao and Aion, deities typical of magical literature, and even some lexical parallels.⁸⁹ Unfortunately, the oracles displaying these features are all late (not earlier than third century AD) so that, considering the process of composition of the *PGM*, it is very difficult to decide whether they were used as sources for the composition of the magical hymns or vice versa. The similarities between the two corpora seem again to imply the circulation of ritual (in this case oracular) texts and their affinity with the magical hymns, but cannot tell us much about the textual history of these compositions.⁹⁰

A different case is represented by the recent publication of a lead tablet from Selinous, dated to the fifth/fourth century BC. It bears some hexameters, probably originating in the fifth century BC, and seems to have functioned as a protective charm to be worn by the initiated. The text has been interpreted in different ways: for example, in connection with the ‘traditional *legomena* of a rite of initiation into the worship of

⁸⁷ Bernand 1969, 583, no. 167, line 1 (beginning of the Roman period); see 1.1.

⁸⁸ See 7.4 and I n.448.

⁸⁹ Merkelbach and Stauber 1996, with rich bibliography: for Aion see no. 26.2 (cf. 1.15); for Iao no. 28.3 (cf. 1.5); for lexical parallels see nos. 25.1, 26.14, 27.1 (cf. 1.16, αὐτοφυής, 3.25, ἀδίδακτος, 7.16, ἀστυφέλικτος); no. 25.2 (πολυώνυμος, e.g. *PGM* VI 24, cf. 8.26, πολύμορφε). Further discussion on these parallels in Nock 1972b; Livrea 1998.

⁹⁰ Cf. Miguélez Caverio 2008, 180–6.

Demeter and Core' or with Dionysiac-Orphic mysteries.⁹¹ Paian is mentioned thrice for his healing power, Hecate (one of the main deities of the magical hymns) appears as the traditional companion of Persephone in her journey into/out of the Underworld, and there are also apotropaic magical words to be found again in the *PGM*.⁹² More interestingly, verse 8 in Col. i is paralleled in *PGM* LXX 12 (third/fourth century AD) and seven verses (Col. i, 8–14) are paralleled in *Suppl.* 49 64–70 (third/fourth century AD).⁹³ In both cases the hexameters appear within invocations but not proper magical hymns. Nevertheless, their persistence proves that the compilers of the *PGM* had at their disposal some metrical ritual texts that originated in a Greek cultural environment and with a long history of transmission.⁹⁴ In this case they may belong to the ritual sphere of the mysteries, but their strong prophylactic nature puts them in close connection with the protective charms of later magical literature. Similarly, the use of inscribing prophylactic incantations and prayers of salvation on portable amulets is well attested in Greek practice, sometimes in connection with mystery cults.⁹⁵

The other approach to reconstructing the textual history of the magical hymns is to look for their antecedents in Egyptian

⁹¹ The so-called Getty Hexameters: Jordan and Kotansky 2011. See now Faraone and Obbink 2013, with many detailed essays. For the connection with Orphic mysteries see Furley, forthcoming. Cf. Gordon 2014.

⁹² Col. i.6, 13, ii.4, 14, 22, iii.7; the magical words, the so-called *Ephesia Grammata*, belong to Greek tradition: Preisendanz, *RAC* 'Ephesia Grammata', 515–18; Schultz 1909; McCown 1923; Bernabé 2003; Bernabé 2013.

⁹³ Cf. *Suppl.* p. 203; for parallels and discussion, Dieterich 1911, 101–3; Jordan 1988, 256–8; Jordan 2001, 190–1.

⁹⁴ Cf. Klinghardt 1999, 28–9. Cf. the cursing rituals found in the *PGM* that developed from earlier Greek *defixiones*: see Faraone 2010, 388–90.

⁹⁵ Kotansky 1991, especially 107–12, 114–16; Graf 1991; cf. Betz 1991; cf. the so-called Orphic golden lamellae dating from the end of the fifth century BC to the second century AD, Pugliese Carratelli 1993; Tortorelli Ghidini 2000, 17–41; see also Faraone 2000, especially 197–209; Faraone 2006; Faraone 2011a, for the possible oral transmission of Greek hexametrical incantations.

INTRODUCTION

literature, as Ritner did for the slander spells (above p. 32). The use of hymns within magico-religious contexts is well attested in Egypt, and one of the best examples is the Harris magical papyrus (XX Dynasty) which incorporates liturgical hymns to Shu and Amun-Re reused as incantations e.g. against snakes and crocodiles.⁹⁶ A Brooklyn magical papyrus of the Late period (paralleled in a Carlsberg papyrus of the late Ptolemaic–early Roman period) still invokes the deity with a long list of the standard hymnographic epithets of the Theban Amun-Re (cf. below pp. 46, and 49–50).⁹⁷ Furthermore, Egyptian religious hymnography was very conservative. For example, Ptolemaic temple hymns are often paralleled in different locations, and some of them are re-adapted copies of texts that can be traced back at least to the New Kingdom and, in some cases, even to the Middle Kingdom:⁹⁸ they might have been copied from a pre-existent monument, but papyrological finds confirm that religious texts were usually stored in the temple archives.⁹⁹ Similarly, two hymns to Amun in the Harris magical papyrus mentioned above are found again in an extended version in the Persian period temple of Amun-Re at Hibis.¹⁰⁰ Another hymn to Amun from the same temple testifies to the standardization and popularity of these hymns thanks to its various attestations: from the edifice of Taharqa by the sacred lake in Karnak, through the Great Pylon of the

⁹⁶ Leitz 1999, BM EA 10042 I.1–III.3, III.10–VI.4; Lange 1927, especially 8–12. On this and the following, Quack 1998, especially 79–81, 87–9.

⁹⁷ P. Brooklyn 47.218.156 in Sauneron 1970, 4.3–4.4 and commentary; paralleled in P. Carlsberg 475: see Quack 2006b; cf. Ritner 1989, 113–14. See especially Assmann 1997b.

⁹⁸ See e.g. Feder 2001 and Czerny 2008, for a Middle Kingdom hymn to Min-Amun with many later parallels (also in the temple of Amun-Re at Hibis).

⁹⁹ Žabkar 1980; Žabkar 1988, 129; Minas-Nerpel 2012, 363–4; Baines 1994, especially 26–7; Graefe 1991, discussing passages traceable back to the Pyramid Texts; also Klotz 2012a, 564, 566.

¹⁰⁰ Leitz 1999 (=Lange 1927), BM EA 10042 III.10–VI.4 = Klotz 2006, IV, III. Cf. Knigge-Salis 2007, 223–8; Quack 2002, 60–1.

temple of Isis at Philae, to a Demotic ostracon of the late Ptolemaic–early Roman period.¹⁰¹

This conservatism allows us to consider much earlier texts when searching for parallels for the magical hymns, but since it is impossible to detect direct lexical parallels, the real problem is to understand if and how Egyptian hymns could be rendered in Greek. Fortunately, there are some examples of Greek hymnography that have been analysed in depth in order to determine whether they could represent or include ‘translations’ of Egyptian praises: mainly the Isiac hymns and aretalogies.¹⁰² Their study has shown that, despite a new interpretation of some traditional features, many attributes of the deity can be traced back to her Egyptian epithets and functions present in both Demotic praises of the Graeco-Roman period and in earlier Hieroglyphic/Hieratic religious texts.¹⁰³ In particular, the four *Hymns* of Isidorus of Narmuthis, which are among the earliest examples of these praises (first century BC), are closer to indigenous religious feelings despite the *interpretatio graeca* of many divine features.¹⁰⁴ In both hymns and aretalogies, traditional contents can be expressed in a different way, but in other cases it seems we are dealing with a direct translation,¹⁰⁵ and even some stylistic/grammatical features are likely to copy Egyptian equivalents.¹⁰⁶ In particular, these

¹⁰¹ Klotz 2006, II; Smith 1977.

¹⁰² Mainly the four *Hymns* of Isidorus of Narmuthis (Vanderlip 1972) and the aretalogies from Andros (*RICIS* 202/1801), Kyme (*RICIS* 302/0204), Thessaloniki (*RICIS* 113/0545), Ios (*RICIS* 202/1101) and Maroneia (*RICIS* 114/0202); cf. Leclant 1984, 1694–1700.

¹⁰³ Especially Peek 1930; Festugière 1949, 221–34; Müller 1961; Bergman 1968; Grandjean 1975; Žabkar 1988, 135–60; Dousa 2002; Quack 2003; Kockelmann 2008; Stadler 2009a, 160–2; Jördens 2013.

¹⁰⁴ Dousa 2002, especially 166–8.

¹⁰⁵ E.g. *ntrt* ‘gt = θεὰ μεγίστη, ‘mightiest goddess’, *hmwt* = ἄνασσα, ‘queen’, *mwł-ntr* = μήτηρ Ὁρου, ‘mother of Horus’, *špšt* = ἀγαθή τύχη, ‘good fortune’; for these and other cases see Kockelmann 2008, 49–68, also summarizing previous contributions.

¹⁰⁶ Quack 2003, 336–9, 362–3; Kockelmann 2008, especially 46 no. 80.

INTRODUCTION

compositions might have been influenced by the Philae hymns and other temple hymns.¹⁰⁷ These examples demonstrate that, even if it is difficult to reconstruct an Egyptian archetype for the compositions in their entirety, Egyptian hymns could be consulted and Egyptian epithets could be translated. Even if partly re-elaborated or widened, Greek metrical renderings of Egyptian praises were possible and might have been more frequent than the extant sources indicate. When a magical hymn addresses the deity as 'self-engendered scarab', the influence of Egyptian hymnography seems to be undeniable:¹⁰⁸ exactly as various Egyptian magical rituals and procedures underlie the *PGM* spells, Egyptian religious literature could have been a source for the composition of the magical hymns (as Ritner demonstrated for the slander spells, above p. 32), perhaps through the mediation of documents such as the Harris or Brooklyn magical papyrus, where liturgical hymns, or scraps of them, had already been incorporated in magical incantations. For example, it has been noted that a dream oracle of the god Bes attested in three versions in the *PGM* (VII 222–49, VIII 64–110, CII 1–17) might derive from a passage of the Harris magical papyrus (8.5–9.5).¹⁰⁹

It is thus possible to catch a glimpse of continuity in both Greek and Egyptian religious literature, but, considering the scarcity of Greek parallels and the difficulty of 'translation' for Egyptian parallels, to rely on the textual transmission does not seem to be the best approach to determine the Greek/Egyptian nature of divinity in the magical hymns. Until new finds illuminate the history of these texts, for the purpose of this study it seems more promising to concentrate on the magico-religious conceptions and stylistic features displayed by the magical hymns, and thus to follow the approach adopted by the latest studies on the subject.

¹⁰⁷ Žabkar 1988, 135–60.

¹⁰⁸ See 3.10–11, 1.32, αὐτογένεθλε, and especially 5.5.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Frankfurter 1998, 172–4, 180; Frankfurter 1997, 121–5.

Egyptian and Greek hymnography: a brief comparison

From a general structural point of view, there are no real differences between Greek and Egyptian hymns.¹¹⁰ They both follow a tripartite scheme, which can be described using the terminology normally applied to Greek hymnography:¹¹¹

- *epicl̥sis*: invocation stating the name (or more names) of the addressed deity, epithets (genealogy), cultic toponyms, etc.¹¹²
- *eulogia*: predication of the deity's power and privileges and actions
- *euchē*: prayer (direct appeal to the god so that he may fulfil the speaker's petitions).¹¹³

Thus, if we are looking for characteristic features, we have to turn either to more specific, internal, structural patterns or to particular stylistic choices.¹¹⁴ For example, within the *eulogia* the

¹¹⁰ A distinction is usually made between hymns and prayers according to the context in which they were used (collective/individual, public/private, etc.), the level of involvement of the speaker, the balance between the *eulogia* and the *euchē*, etc. (Barucq 1962, 22–4). Here I shall try to summarize a few general aspects that can be considered valid for both sub-genres. For a summary of the history of the studies on Egyptian hymns, Knigge-Salis 2006, 9–30 (though in other respects a very problematic publication: see Quack 2007).

¹¹¹ Furley and Bremer 2001, I.50–64; Bremer 1981, especially 194–7; Furley 1995, 34–5. For Egyptian hymns, Assmann, *LdÄ* 'Hymnus'; Barucq 1962, 24–31, who uses a slightly different subdivision. Cf. Burkert 1994.

¹¹² A typical feature of the Greek *epicl̥sis* is what Race 1982, 5–8, calls 'finding the ἀρχή': the poet refers to the action of 'beginning' the hymn and/or hesitates pretending not to know how to begin. On the contrary, Egyptian hymns normally start with a sort of 'title' or introduction stating the kind of religious act involved, the names of the god and the worshipper, and the time of the day or the way in which the hymn has to be recited (Barucq 1962, 48–59, 126–32).

¹¹³ In Egyptian hymns this section is extremely reduced (and the petitioner is normally identified with the Pharaoh); on the contrary, the prayers tend to extend it and focus on the individual (Barucq 1962, 24–9).

¹¹⁴ Metrics cannot be taken into consideration: though there are various studies on the Egyptian metrical system, the issue is still under debate. What seems to be certain is the 'stress' nature (vs. the Greek and Latin

INTRODUCTION

Greek hymn normally adds a 'narrative' section describing one or more remarkable mythological deeds performed by the deity in question in order to please the god and 'suggest suitable ways for him to act'.¹¹⁵ The same cannot be said for the Egyptian hymn, in which a real narration is absent in the majority of cases as the mythological events are presented as preassumed so that they, and their consequences, may be mentioned but not recounted, with the sole exception of cosmogonical narratives. Similarly, the Greek *eulogia* can include a so-called *hypomnēsis*, a section that reminds the god either of the way in which he helped the speaker on a previous occasion or of the way in which the speaker previously honoured the god. In Egyptian hymnography, while the latter kind of *hypomnēsis* can be found in the *euchē*,¹¹⁶ the former does not exist. That is, the Greek worshipper refers to the specific way in which the god previously intervened in his life or in the community's in order to create a precedent for the fulfilment of the prayer, while in the Egyptian hymns we can recognize only a vague cause-and-effect relation between the general essence of the god and his ability to help the petitioner.¹¹⁷ Likewise, where the Greek hymn can describe in detail how the god was born and obtained his functions, the Egyptian tends simply to state his genealogy and consider his functions as innate.

These structural differences can all be considered as 'concretizations' of the underlying expressive patterns, inherent in one or the other culture, which Norden called 'dynamische

'quantitative') of the Egyptian metre. See Fecht 1964; Fecht 1965; Fecht 1993; Foster 1975, especially 6–8; Mathieu 1994 (and his earlier articles there quoted). For a summary of the studies, Parkinson 2002, 112–17.

¹¹⁵ Furley 1995, 40–5: divine intervention would be the purpose underlying all three sections of the hymn; cf. Race 1982, 10–12.

¹¹⁶ Egyptian hymns tend to focus on the moral virtues of the petitioner and not on the specific actions he did to please the god (Barucq 1962, 380–5).

¹¹⁷ In Egyptian hymnography, a separate case is represented by the so-called prayers of penitence: the speaker describes his present affliction as a divine punishment inflicted on him for his previous sins and asks for forgiveness (Barucq 1962, 24, 29–30).

Prädikationsart' and 'essentielle Prädikationsart', referring respectively to the Greek and the Near Eastern way of praising a god.¹¹⁸ In the 'dynamic predication', or 'predication of powers', the deity is lauded according to his/her actions or ability to do something ('you do/did/will do this and that'), while, in the 'essential predication', the greatest part of the hymn is devoted to the description of the intrinsic characteristics of the god, of his/her essence ('you are this and that').

Obviously, these differences in praising patterns depend on differences in theology, which, in their turn, result from a different logical system underlying the conception of reality. In Egyptian thought, the affirmation of identity is a way of describing reality: synthetic symbology of images is preferred over an analytic logic of descriptions. For example, Egyptians can choose an image implying various attributes and simply say that the god X manifests himself in the form of a scarab, while if a Greek wanted, just hypothetically, to express the same range of attributes he would say that god X is the god of the sun at dawn and he created himself at the beginning of time; following the same 'imagistic' principle of the Egyptian *ḥkꜣ* connecting the divine with the human/natural world (above pp. 17–18), the scarab, owing to its particular characteristics (see 3.10–11), can be a manifestation, an image of the solar god. Similarly, instead of being 'victorious' (adjective), the god X can be 'Horus the one who overthrows his enemies' (identity). For, even saying that a god is another god does not mean anything but to attribute the qualities of the second deity to the first one. Following the same principle, the gods, apart from 'having some qualities', can 'become something else', i.e. they can manifest themselves in different forms or different deities (*ḥprw*, 'forms, manifestations', from the verb *ḥpr*, which means both 'to become' and 'to come into existence', 'to be'). In the course of Egyptian history when different cult centres grew in

¹¹⁸ Norden 1956, 207–39.

INTRODUCTION

importance, their principal deity tended to assume universal connotations. Therefore, this system of *hprw* became even more extended, since the minor local deities could be interpreted as ‘manifestations’ of the god of the capital.¹¹⁹

This peculiar system of thought partially explains why, speaking of style in general, the characteristic that Parkinson recognized in many Egyptian literary genres as a possible trace of an early oral culture is certainly a distinctive feature of Egyptian hymnography: ‘the patterning of expression is often additive rather than subordinative and the use of formulae is prominent and aggregative rather than analytic, as when epithets appear in long sequences’.¹²⁰

In particular, the Egyptian hymnic speech tends to develop according to two basic stylistic forms that Assmann called ‘Nennen’ and ‘Verklären’. The former, consisting in ‘naming’ the god’s names, epithets and functions, is also present in the Greek hymn with the difference that, in the Egyptian, it can become extremely extended and adheres to a ‘nominal style’ (adjectives, appositions, participles): it describes the ‘atemporal’ essence of the god. The latter, which uses a ‘verbal style’ (finite verbs), consists in the depiction of the nature of the god ‘in process’, in his transfiguring into his various manifestations: it describes the ‘temporary’ essence of the god.¹²¹ In any case,

¹¹⁹ Hornung 1996, especially 113–28; Piankoff 1964, 5, 10–19; Pfeiffer 2005, 288–9; Kaper 2005, especially 305; see **Intro.** n.151. This possibility of appearing in different manifestations is not just a prerogative of gods: in a difficult situation even someone with the right knowledge can become something else, assuming those qualities that will help him overcome the present danger. The same idea underlies the identification with deities within magical literature: the magician obtains access to a mythical situation in which the god has specific characteristics necessary for the magical procedure. See Nordh 1996, 49–61, especially for curse and blessing formulae; cf. Federn 1960.

¹²⁰ Parkinson 2002, 56.

¹²¹ Assmann, *LdÄ* ‘Hymnus’. For a detailed discussion on the concepts of ‘Nennen’ and ‘Verklären’ (the latter first formulated by Schott 1945, in relation to Osirian funerary cults) see Assmann 1975, 26–45; Assmann 1969, 342–58, 363–7; Assmann 1996; different terminology but similar ideas in Barucq 1962, 94–9, 133–73; BD, 29–33.

even if a verbal style of predication is used, in most cases the Egyptian hymn does not strictly 'narrate', i.e. it does not recount actions or events that have a specific place or development in time, but describes the way in which the deity manifests himself in the world in an undefined but constantly present time. If a story is told, it is almost always cosmological and not mythological: to quote the definition given by Assmann for the Egyptian solar hymns, we should talk of an 'iconography of images' instead of a 'mythology of stories'.¹²²

To give an example, the hymns belonging to the traditional solar theology, the style of which influenced all Egyptian hymnography starting from the Ramessid period, describe the cyclical journey of the sun. The manifestations of the sun god correspond to the four phases of the solar course so that the hymn is organized into four thematic units represented by the four times of the day: morning, midday, evening, night. Even if these different phases can be interpreted on more than one semantic level (the cosmic, the ritual, the funerary and the kingship level), they always describe the same process of cyclical regeneration. The verbal style, prevalent in these compositions, is not used to narrate events that have a starting and an ending point in time, but as performative speech depicting a series of changes in state, of transfigurations, re-enacting themselves every day.¹²³ Apart from this specific case, the absence of proper narrative sections is a phenomenon involving all Egyptian hymnography, so that it can be considered as a distinctive feature in comparison with Greek hymns: we can find many

¹²² Assmann 1995, 38–42; Assmann 2001a, 102–13; on the particular status of myth in Egyptian literature see Baines 1996, especially 364–5. The Isis aretalogies would seem to represent an exception, but actually they cannot be considered as an example of traditional Egyptian hymnography because, apart from their late date, they address in Greek an already Hellenized deity so that even traditional contents can be expressed with different stylistic patterns (see pp. 37–8 above).

¹²³ Assmann 1969, 333–9; Assmann 1975, 27 ff.; Assmann 1995, 38–66; Assmann 1996, especially 328–9; Barucq 1962, 252–6; BD, 115–20.

INTRODUCTION

‘allusions’ to well-known myths (especially cosmological) but would never find a narration, such as that about the god’s childhood in the *Homeric Hymn* (*HH*) to Hermes.

Two other rhetorical features largely adopted in Egyptian poetry and practically irrelevant in the Greek are the so-called *parallelismus membrorum* and the extensive use of wordplays that are characteristic of the highest stylistic registers.¹²⁴ The former can be defined as the correlation of ‘members’ (cola, verses, or simply phrases, depending on the extent of the analysis) in couplets (triplets, or more) obtained by placing semantic equivalents in an equivalent syntactic position. The semantic relation established within these ‘thought couplets’ can be of various kinds, going from synonymy to antonymy (e.g. ‘the mountains tremble in the time of his rage, the earth shakes when he starts roaring’, or ‘justice was given to him who does what is liked, and injustice to him who does what is disliked’).¹²⁵ As far as wordplays are concerned, they are inherent in the Egyptian attitude towards writing and speaking, which considers these actions as ‘creative’, ‘life-giving’: through the utterance or the writing of a name what is named is not only identified as a specific entity, but it is also brought into existence. The ‘name’ of something is a fundamental part of its ‘essence’, and ‘not to have a name’ means ‘not to exist’.¹²⁶ This principle also explains the great importance of the name in magic, where for example threatening ‘the name of someone’ corresponds to a threat of annihilation, and knowing the secret name of a god means to have power over him.¹²⁷ In Egyptian

¹²⁴ See Parkinson 2002, 120, 124–5; Barucq 1962, 292.

¹²⁵ Hintze 1950, 146–9; Assmann, *LdÄ* ‘Parallelismus membrorum’; Norden 1956, 355–64. For the *parallelismus membrorum* applied to the study of the Egyptian metrical system see Foster 1975, especially 8–17, and Foster 1994 with bibliography.

¹²⁶ Exactly as the name is considered to be one of the five components of the human being: Vernus, *LdÄ* ‘Name’; Piankoff 1964, 3–9.

¹²⁷ Brunner-Traut, *LdÄ* ‘Namenstilgung’; cf. Nordh 1996, 94–6 on curses with the formula ‘his name shall not exist’.

literature this name-essence equivalence explains why the former is often conceived as an explanation of the latter in the so-called etymological puns, for example, 'his name is hidden (*imn*), in his name of Amun (*Īmn*)'.¹²⁸ The name-essence connection probably also underlies the use of this stylistic contrivance applied to longer units: an entire phrase can be formed by different words deriving from the same root or by the same word repeated in a different inflection (polyptoton) in order to draw attention wholly to a specific concept, for example *nfr nfrt nfr r.f*, 'only the goodness of the good man is good beyond him'.¹²⁹ this taste for the *figura etymologica* and the polyptoton is another distinctive feature of Egyptian hymnography, together with the etymological puns.

In conclusion, in terms of form, the main differences between Greek and Egyptian hymns are more stylistic than structural. On the other hand, distinctive features can more easily be recognized if we examine the content: that is, theological ideas that find an expression in specific recurrent motifs. Basically, the Egyptian hymn (unlike the Greek), from the New Kingdom onwards, becomes very standardized as the solar and Osirian themes start to spread over the entire pantheon and all the principal deities acquire the potential to become creator gods. Thus, the motifs previously confined to a specific domain become characteristic of the greatest part of Egyptian hymnography. It is worthwhile briefly to summarize here some of these motifs that, though already present in Egyptian religious thought in different contexts, start to appear together in the New Kingdom with the Theban elaboration of the Amun-Re theology. They owe their significance to their absence from classical Greek hymnography and can thus be considered as distinctive of Egyptian religious thought.¹³⁰

¹²⁸ Spiegel, *LdÄ* 'Ätiologie', 80-3; Assmann 2001a, 83-7.

¹²⁹ Parkinson 1991, 43, B1 337/B2 72; Parkinson 2002, 124-5.

¹³⁰ This is a summary of Assmann's analysis; for a comprehensive discussion, Assmann 1975, 64-77; Assmann 1979; Assmann 1983; Assmann 1995,

INTRODUCTION

The god is described as

- ‘One’, ‘unique’: but without excluding the existence of the other gods that are conceived as manifestations of the ‘One’.
- ‘Hidden’: his name is unknown, nothing can be known about him, he is hidden as he can manifest himself in every form or in every other deity, he is the one ‘who makes himself into millions’, *unus qui est omnia*.
- ‘Primordial’: he is the first god of the primeval time who came into being by himself.
- ‘Creator’: he created everything that exists.
- ‘Sun god’: as such he can manifest himself in various forms corresponding to the three/four phases of the sun (dawn, midday, sunset/night), e.g. child/adult man/old man (human), scarab/lion/ram (animal).
- ‘Cosmic god’: he did not only create the world, he also ‘is’ the world.
- ‘Maintainer of the cosmos’: he preserves his creation by nourishing and reviving the cosmos every day and does this especially by manifesting himself in the three life-giving elements light, air (wind, breath) and water (mainly of the Nile).
- ‘Ruler god’: he rules over his creation.
- ‘Ethical authority’: he governs life and death, fate is in his hand, he is omnipresent and omniscient, he is the lord of justice and truth, salvation or punishment depends on him.

These themes, which have been summarized in the expression ‘henotheistic pantheism’, did not disappear after the New Kingdom, but were extended to other deities and had a new

102–210; Assmann 1996, 329–34; Assmann 1997a, 168–207; Assmann 2001a, 189–244; also Assmann *LdÄ* ‘Sonnengott’; Knigge-Salis 2006, 63–70, 78–9 (**Intro.** n.110, always cf. Quack 2007); cf. Barucq 1962, 172–3, 202–9, 220–9, 295; BD, 32–6; MT, I.127–9; Klotz 2012b, 58–66. Also Otto, *LdÄ* ‘Amun’, especially G. See also Zandee 1992 for many Egyptian epithets of the creator god.

peak of popularity during the Libyan and Persian periods. It has been suggested that this late Egyptian hymnography, in a period of great cross-cultural interchange, was influenced by Jewish theology and other foreign conceptions. Although this is probable, the motives typical of the Ramessid Theban Amun-Re remain still present and easily identifiable even when slightly modified, so that these compositions maintain a great continuity with earlier religious thought.¹³¹

From the Third Intermediate period onwards the solar, cosmic and creative aspect of the god is increasingly represented by iconographic means through the hybrid images of the polymorphic deities, the so-called Panthei.¹³² In their simplest forms we can find, for example, the four-ram-headed Amun-Re embodying the cosmos through the completeness expressed by the number four in Egyptian symbology (four cardinal points, four winds, four elements, etc.). His image is thoroughly described by one of the above-mentioned hymns to Amun-Re from the Persian period temple of Hibis where the creative-cosmic aspect of the god is especially stressed.¹³³ The more complex images are also often found in connection with Amun-Re, and seem to have been an artificial creation aimed at graphically representing the idea – originally developed by the theology of this god – of a cosmic solar deity whose body is the world and who reunites in himself the whole

¹³¹ Stadler 2009a; Klotz 2006, 1–3, 10–15; Knigge-Salis 2007; also Knigge-Salis 2006, especially 279–306 (**Intro.** n.110, always cf. Quack 2007). On the continuity and evolution of the Amun-Re theology see also Kákósy 1995a, especially 2962–8.

¹³² For criticism on the use of this term and on earlier scholarly interpretations see Quack 2006a, 175–6; Koenig 2009, 320–1, 323. On polymorphic deities and all the following see Sauneron 1970, 13–14; Sauneron 1960, 284–5; Kaper 2003, 79–104; Quaegebeur 1984; Assmann 1997b; cf. Sternberg-El Hotabi 1999, 25–7; Michel 2002, especially 6–16, 27; cf. Mastrocinque 2003, 74–8.

¹³³ Quaegebeur 1991, especially 260–3; Klotz 2006, 9, IV.31–2, 167–70, cf. II.53–65, 182–5. On the four-ram-headed solar god see also Quack 1996, especially 315, 321–2; on the number four see **I** n.206.

INTRODUCTION

pantheon.¹³⁴ The best example is the so-called Bes-Pantheos. This god, attested from the end of the Third Intermediate period and especially popular in the Late and Ptolemaic periods, is a hybrid deity with the head of the original (lion)-dwarf god Bes,¹³⁵ two or more arms and wings, and often ithyphallic; his body can have animal grafts (especially leonine protomes and the tail of a falcon) and be covered with eyes; he wears a complex headdress, usually with ram horns, solar disc, uraeus and animal protomes functioning as multiple heads; he can be encircled by flames and stand on an ouroboros snake which can contain a series of dangerous animals that have been interpreted either as his helpers or as vanquished enemies (see 1.15 p. 81).¹³⁶ Another popular polymorphic deity in the

¹³⁴ It has usually been hypothesized that these polymorphic deities are a representation of the *ḥꜣw* of Amun-Re, his ‘effective powers’ (see literature on polymorphic deities in **Intro.** n.132). The *ḥꜣw* of a god are the means through which the divine power can manifest itself and operate remotely in the world, and thus they can also be personified as independent entities in the so-called emissaries of the gods: they embody the visible aspects of the divine puissance (Žabkar, *LdÄ* ‘Ba’; Žabkar 1968; Borghouts 1987, 37–9; Taylor 2001, 15–16, 20–2; Sauneron 1960, 284–5; Assmann, *LdÄ* ‘Persönlichkeitsbegriff und -bewußtsein’; cf. Loprieno 2003, 207–11; Goelet in Von Dassow, Wasserman, Faulkner and Goelet 1994, 150–3). According to this theory the polymorphic images would stress the invisibility, concealment and transcendence of the god, who cannot be depicted directly but only through the representation of his *ḥꜣw*. Unfortunately, this interpretation is based on one single passage from the previously mentioned Brooklyn magical papyrus (**Intro.** n.97), which was supposed to state that the polymorphic deity represented in a complementary vignette is ‘the Ba’s of Amun-Re’. However, Quack (2006a, especially 178–81) demonstrated that this passage cannot be used to explain the nature of the deity since it was misinterpreted and does not refer to the polymorphic image of the papyrus. See also Quack 2006b, especially 58–60; Quack, in press.

¹³⁵ On the early lion iconography of Bes see Romano 1980 and 1998 with bibliography; on the solar symbolism of dwarfs in Ancient Egypt, Dasen 1993.

¹³⁶ Tran Tam Tinh, *LIMC* ‘Bes’ II.F; Sternberg-El Hotabi 1999, 110–12; Frankfurter 1998, 124–32; cf. DD, 126–41; Michel 2002, 4–6; cf. Hilton Price 1901. The two proposed functions of the dangerous animals in the ouroboros snake are actually not incompatible since the vanquished enemies of the god, once defeated, could have served as his helpers and protectors: see Ritner 1993, 128 footnote 583; Quack 2006a, 177–8.

Graeco-Roman period is the sphinx god Tutu (Tithoes),¹³⁷ whose iconography seems to be a representation, a *twtw*, 'image', of Amun-Re.¹³⁸ The Panthei, reuniting in themselves so many powers with their band of attributes and animal components, had, together with a solar-creative aspect, a strong apotropaic-destructive function, which explains their popularity in late Egyptian magic.¹³⁹ For example, Bes-Pantheos can appear on the so-called cippi of Horus on the crocodiles: these stelai, especially popular during the Late and Ptolemaic periods, focused on a central image of Horus the child and were inscribed with healing or repelling spells against dangerous animals; the power of the incantations could be absorbed by drinking water that had been poured over the stele.¹⁴⁰ On one of the best-preserved cippi, the Metternich Stele (XXX Dynasty), we can find texts that, in abbreviated versions, also recur on other cippi. The central theme is the myth of Isis asking the help of Thoth to save Horus the child stung by a scorpion. Together with this and similar mythological *historiolae*, we find images of the four-ram-headed Amun-Re and invocations and hymns to for example Re, Min and to a solar deity called 'the old man who rejuvenates himself in his time, the elderly man who becomes child again' (alluding to the daily regeneration of the sun), who may be identified with Bes-Pantheos appearing at the top of the back of the stele.¹⁴¹ In the previously mentioned magical papyrus of the Brooklyn Museum, aimed at providing magical

¹³⁷ His nature is solar and apotropaic at the same time. See Kaper 2003; Sauneron 1960; Quaegebeur, *LdÄ*, 'Tithoes'; Kákosy 1995a, 2982–5.

¹³⁸ Kaper 2003, 111–13, 190, 204; Michel 2002, especially 21–3.

¹³⁹ Puech 1930; Frankfurter 1998, 115–20; Frankfurter 2012, 328–9; Michel 2002, especially 6–9, 13–16; Quack 2006a; Quack 2006b, 58–62.

¹⁴⁰ Kákosy, *LdÄ* 'Horusstele'; Kákosy 1987; Kákosy 2000; Kákosy 2001; Kákosy 2002; Satzinger 1987; Sternberg-El Hotabi 1999, especially 8–19; Gasse 2004; Ritner 1989, especially 105–11; Frankfurter 1998, 47–9.

¹⁴¹ Golénisheff 1877; Sander-Hansen 1956, especially 30–1, lines 38–9; Scott 1951; Kousoulis 2002; Seele 1947, 46–8; Budge 1904, 267–74; cf. Kákosy 1999, 20; Malaise 1990, 706.

INTRODUCTION

protection against all enemies alive or dead, all the dangers of this world and the Netherworld,¹⁴² two vignettes depict Bes-Pantheos and the text invokes him with many traditional epithets of Amun-Re and seems to describe him as ‘the great and mysterious forms of Amun which are usually hidden to gods and men’.¹⁴³ Furthermore, the four-ram-headed Amun-Re can appear on the Late period hypocephali used in funerary magic to grant the protection of the head of the deceased,¹⁴⁴ and Bes-Pantheos often appears on Graeco-Egyptian magical amulets.¹⁴⁵ Therefore, from the Late to the Roman period the Theban theology of Amun-Re did not only survive in temple texts, but also played a prominent role in late magic and popular religion thanks to the development of the polymorphic deities and of their strong apotropaic–destructive function.¹⁴⁶

Selection and organization of the material

The choice of the magical hymns implies that the Greek deities will be used as the starting point for the organization of the selected material, since these metrical sections are not addressed to Egyptian or ‘foreign’ gods. However, talking about either ‘Greek’ or ‘Egyptian deities’ at this stage is just a convenient contrivance and refers simply to their names and not to their natures.

¹⁴² Sauneron 1970, 6–11.

¹⁴³ Sauneron 1970, 4.2, 4.6–4.7, 11–16, fig. 2–3 (and cf. P. Carlsberg 475, in Quack 2006b); Klotz 2006, 50–1; cf. Ritner 1989; on the continuity between polymorphic deities and the Theban theology of Amun-Re see also Assmann 1979; Assmann 1997a, 192–207; Assmann 2001a, 234–44.

¹⁴⁴ The fact that these hypocephali have been found on the body of the clergy of Amun or Montu puts them in strict connection with Theban theology: Varga 1961; Klotz 2006, 182–3.

¹⁴⁵ Bonner 1950, 156–60; DD, 126–41; Michel 2001, 37–9; Michel 2002, especially 6–12 on the solar and cosmic aspects of the Pantheos; Quack 2006a, 182–6; cf. Bakowska 2001; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 220–1. Sternberg-El Hotabi 1999, 163–70 on the continuity of the motif.

¹⁴⁶ Quack 1998, especially 79–81, 87–9.

My studies on the *PGM* have led me to the conclusion that the magical hymns can be divided into two main groups showing thematic unity according to the deities involved, whether directly addressed by the hymns or addressed by the spells in which the hymns appear. First of all, the majority of metrical sections invoke five main deities: a solar god (sometimes Helios); a creator god; Apollo; Hecate; and Selene.¹⁴⁷ These hymns are often also longer than the remaining ones (addressed to Hermes, Aphrodite and Typhon-Seth).¹⁴⁸ They can be further divided into two subgroups: hymns to the solar/creator god (Helios) and Apollo, and hymns to Hecate and Selene.

In fact, as is typical of the *PGM*, these deities are often associated, if not identified, with each other or with other gods.¹⁴⁹ Generally, this phenomenon is one of the distinctive traits of the religious ideology that started to spread with the Hellenistic period, when the overcoming of particularistic trends ushered in a new mobility of peoples and ideas and a new cosmopolitan approach. The prevalent tendency towards the depersonalization of divinity favoured not only the coupling of the national deities with the corresponding 'foreign' ones (which somehow is inherent in polytheistic systems), but also the shifting of many minor deities into the field of action of the main ones.¹⁵⁰ Such ease of assimilation was certainly promoted

¹⁴⁷ Helios-Apollo and Selene-Hecate remain two of the most significant deities of the *PGM* even when we consider the whole corpus according to the frequency of occurrences of deities' names and to the frequency of spells addressed to them.

¹⁴⁸ V 400–20, VII 668–80, XVIIIb (Hermes); IV 2902–39 (Aphrodite); IV 179–201, 261–73 (Typhon-Seth); plus a short metrical section addressed to multiple chthonic deities/entities in IV 1459–69.

¹⁴⁹ Considering the juxtaposition or interchangeability of their names and not the deep nature of the gods in question.

¹⁵⁰ Sometimes this process ended by divesting deities of many of their individual connotations, to the point of considering them more as universal symbols of a specific natural aspect: for example, the growing importance, starting from the first century, of the worship of the sun god, who eventually assimilated almost all male deities, both Greek and foreign. For a detailed summary of the situation in Roman Egypt see Kákosy 1995a, 2948–88; on

INTRODUCTION

by contact with Egyptian religion, which had always adopted this expedient in order to bring back into unity the multifarious local manifestations of the same gods and/or to gather under a single name or symbol the multiple aspects of a kind of divinity which was conceived more as a plurality of manifestations (*hprw*, and ‘forms’, *irw*) of the same power than of distinct identities (the obvious example being Re-Atum-Khepri).¹⁵¹ Furthermore, magic was no doubt a privileged field for this phenomenon: the necessity of knowing the ‘hidden, true name’ in order to obtain control over a deity favoured the use of divine names or epithets as ‘secret’, second names of different gods (almost as happens with the *voces magicae*).

Returning to the magical hymns to the solar/creator god (Helios), Apollo, Hecate and Selene, for example, in II 64–183 a first metrical section addressed to Apollo is followed by a second addressed to Helios; but the addressee has not changed and the two gods appear to be identified. In VI 1–47 the magician is supposed to have an encounter with Helios, but he invokes Apollo Phoibos.¹⁵² In IV 2622–707 the ritual involves an image of Hecate, but the spell and the hymn are addressed to Selene. In IV 2708–84, 2785–890 Hecate, Core, Artemis, Persephone and Selene are used as different names of the same goddess.¹⁵³ Generally speaking, all these deities

different forms of syncretism see Lévêque 1973; cf. the remarks of Smith 2003, 30–6 on magic as religion of ‘anywhere’.

¹⁵¹ See **Intro.** n.119; Hornung 1996, especially 185–96, 217–26; Barucq 1962, 179–80; Griffiths 1982; cf. Daumas 1965, 48–9, 115, 120–4; Pfeiffer 2005. This process became more and more noticeable starting from the New Kingdom: Knigge-Salis 2006, 78–9 (**Intro.** n.110, always cf. Quack 2007); Dunand 1973a, 85–9. On the contrary, in Greek religion the main tendency is not to identify, but to assimilate through myth or genealogy.

¹⁵² Similarly, in III 187–262 we find two interchangeable hymns: one to Helios, the other to Apollo. In another hymn to Helios (IV 296–466, 1928–2005) the god is invoked as his Egyptian equivalent, Horus.

¹⁵³ Similarly, in IV 2441–621 a first hymn invokes a goddess as Artemis, Persephone, Selene and Aphrodite, while a second hymn calls her Selene and ‘Hermes and Hecate at the same time’ (the only exception as far as gender is concerned, cf. **1.1**:25–44, **G**). The hymn in IV 1390–495 invokes a goddess

appear to be susceptible to being identified with each other according to their gender. In the majority of cases it is clear, even at a first reading, that, when considering the whole spells, the male or female gender corresponds to a solar/creative or lunar/chthonic basic nature of the deity invoked. The only few exceptions are found among the hymns addressed to the male deity, where in a couple of cases it is not immediately clear whether the god has solar traits or not. Nevertheless, these two groups appear to be 'complementary' inasmuch as they address deities that are perceived by the compilers of the *PGM* as representing two main poles: the solar-creative and the lunar-chthonic aspect.

On the contrary, in the remaining hymns to Hermes, Aphrodite and Typhon-Seth, the deities tend to stick to their specificity even when considered in the context of the spells. Moreover, they cannot be considered complementary or be paired in any way, so that their hymns require a different kind of analysis: they cannot be directly compared as far as the nature of divinity is concerned, and should be investigated as single units according to the single deity. Therefore, they are not analysed in this study, which focuses on the hymns to the solar/creator god (Helios), Apollo, Hecate and Selene.¹⁵⁴ According to the features outlined above, the selected material has been organized in relation to two 'divine units': hymns addressed to the male¹⁵⁵ deity and hymns addressed to the female chthonic/lunar deity (for the sake of convenience they

called interchangeably Persephone-Core or Hecate, but it is followed by a second invocation in which the same Hecate and Core appear as separate entities in simple association. This is just a brief overview but the same trend is attested throughout the whole corpus.

¹⁵⁴ This subdivision also reflects a different scholarly usage. In fact, the hymns selected for this study are also those more often discussed or quoted by scholars, while the remaining metrical sections are more rarely dealt with and thus would appeal to a more specific audience. Nevertheless, I plan to publish these 'minor' hymns (with commentary and analysis) in the near future.

¹⁵⁵ The solar-creative, lunar-chthonic subdivision proved useful in order to create two theoretical units, but it applies when considering not only the

INTRODUCTION

have been assigned a number corresponding to the order in which they will be discussed):

<i>PGM</i> hymns	Identification numbers
Male deity:	
- I 296–327, 341–7	I
- II 2–7	6
- II 81–102	7
- III 198–230	3
- III 549–58	4
- IV 436–61, 1957–89 and VIII 74–81	2
- IV 939–48	5
- VI 6–44	8
- XII 244–52	9
Female chthonic/lunar deity:	
- IV 1399–434	10
- IV 2242–347	11
- IV 2522–67	12
- IV 2574–610, 2643–74	13
- IV 2714–83	14
- IV 2786–870	15

Immediately after **3** there is another metrical section used as an alternative or further invocation (III 234–58). Preisendanz published it as hymn 12, but the passage is so fragmentary that it has been almost entirely reconstructed. Thus, it will not be taken into consideration, though some of the epithets that are certainly recognizable will be recorded and analysed within the commentary to the other hymns.

hymns in themselves but also the spells in which they appear. The analysis will show how the hymns to the female deity always display a lunar/chthonic aspect even when considered only in themselves; the same does not apply to the hymns to the male deity which, considered outside the context of their spells, do not always display a solar/creative aspect. Therefore, I choose the generic title ‘hymns to the male deity’ in order to avoid confusion between my programmatic subdivision and the actual nature of divinity described by the hymns belonging to this category.

The fundamental edition remains Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae – Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri* (Pr), to be complemented by the more recent Merkelbach and Totti, *Abrasax* (MT), in which only some of the hymns are published. In fact, although I checked all the texts of the hymns against digital images of the papyri, I can hardly talk of a ‘new’ edition. The very rare cases in which my reading is different from the previous editions (recorded in the apparatus as Bortolani) usually concern a single letter which anyhow does not affect the meaning of the text, or sometimes I adopt or discuss readings that, though not appearing in the final text chosen by MT or Pr, were suggested by Preisendanz’s collaborators or by previous editors and appear in his critical apparatus. Nevertheless there was still room for some minor improvements. For example, in a few cases square brackets (used for a lacuna or a gap in the text) were misplaced, or angle brackets (used for erroneously omitted characters), were used instead of curly brackets (used for characters considered superfluous by the editor), or vice versa. In a few other cases I reject generally accepted emendations. Furthermore, I suggest some new interpretations that will be discussed in the commentary.

A reference to Pr or MT appears at the beginning of every hymn: this means that, if not otherwise stated in the apparatus, the text of the hymn is the same as the mentioned edition. Whenever the papyrus presents graphical features (such as the insertion of a letter above the line) that do not create any interpretation problem, they will generally not be recorded. Similarly, all the corrections and readings proposed by Preisendanz’s collaborators do not appear in my apparatus: I indicate them only when a reading was either adopted in my text, or is significant for the interpretation of the contents (for the exhaustive critical apparatus, see Preisendanz’s edition).

Furthermore, it should be remembered that when Pr appears as the guide edition, I do not refer to the ‘reconstructed’ versions of the hymns appearing at the end of the second volume (they are mentioned at the beginning of every hymn only for the sake

INTRODUCTION

of comparison). Since my aim is to preserve the original context as much as possible, I do not consider the different reconstruction attempts unless indispensable for the meaning (such as the erroneous omission of a word). This means, first, that the different attestations of the same hymn are analysed separately, unless they are almost identical: in that case, the variants are recorded in the critical apparatus. Secondly, the non-metrical sections or *voces magicæ* are included when they appear within the metrical text. Finally, there are no significant corrections to the metre, and thus, as a general impression, prosody will be much clumsier than usual. Moreover, the metre will not be analysed unless it is significant for readings affecting the interpretation of the content. In spite of prosodic imperfections, the hymns are arranged in verses. The translation is different from Betz's edition in as far as it tries to be as literal as possible, even if, sometimes, overlaps are unavoidable.

Although the line-by-line commentary to the hymns can prove useful in itself and be consulted when needed, it is fundamental for the development of the discussion since it investigates the Greek or Egyptian nature of divinity, and thus draws the bases for the final Conclusions. For this reason, the concluding chapter very often refers back to passages in the commentary which are indispensable for a comprehensive understanding of this study. Given the importance of the commentary, I wanted it to be easily readable and as fluent as possible. Therefore, considering also that, though partly philological, it mainly focuses on religious conceptions, I decided not to follow the practice (customary for philological commentaries) of embedding the footnotes in the text, but I deliberately kept them separate.

Latinate forms are generally used for the names of Greek deities (with a few exceptions for those deities whose names always appear in Greek spelling within studies on the *PGM*) and those of Egyptian follow Redford (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*. In some very rare cases abbreviated references to classical authors differ from LSJ since they are slightly expanded in order to be unambiguous.

PART I

HYMNS TO THE MALE DEITY

HYMNS 1 AND 2

FOUR VERSIONS OF A HYMN TO APOLLO-HELIOS-HORUS

Four attestations of the same hymn appear in three different papyri, within four different spells. In spite of the differences, these metrical sections testify to the existence of a well-known ‘original’ Helios hymn, which became Preisendanz’s reconstructed hymn 4.¹

HYMN 1

VERSION ONE, TO APOLLO: I 296–327 AND 341–7 (FOURTH/FIFTH CENTURY)

This metrical section is included in the four versions of the same hymn to Apollo-Helios-Horus because lines 20–30 (315–25) are paralleled in the other attestations. However, the rest of the hymn does not appear in the other versions, but is partly paralleled in 3 (the single references will be given in the Commentary). For this reason, this metrical section will be analysed separately.

The hymn is part of a lamp divination (I 262–347) entitled ‘Apollonian invocation’: Apollo is invoked so that he, or a ‘divine spirit’ sent by him, can appear in the flame of the lamp and answer the magician’s questions.

- Preliminaries and rite: The magician writes magical characters on the seven leaves of a laurel branch, wears a ‘prophetic garment’ and holds an ebony staff in one hand and the

¹ Dilthey 1872; Wessely 1886, 190–4; Heitsch 1959, 215–22; Riess 1935, 107–8; Fauth 1995, 53–5.

branch in the other. He has to prepare a lamp and an altar, and to make a burnt offering.

- Invocation: The **hymn** invokes the god so that he sends a daimon to prophesy. From the prose part of the spell it would seem that the god himself or a ‘divine spirit’ is supposed to appear in the flame of the lamp. However, the hymn alludes to a necromantic procedure, and thus implies that Apollo has to send the spirit of a dead person. This confusion probably arose from the re-employment of the hymn in a new context.
- Purpose and release: After having asked the god/spirit about ‘prophecy’, ‘(divination with) epic poems’, ‘sending and interpreting dreams’, etc., the magician dismisses him, moving the ebony staff into the hand with the laurel branch and vice versa, and reciting the second part of the **hymn** (I 341–7).

In Preisendanz, lines 3–17 and 33–5 (297–311, 342–5) form the reconstructed hymn 23; the first verse (lines 296–7), an iambic trimeter, is considered as the only surviving line of hymn 8, while the rest of the hymn, lines 20–30 (315–25), are part of the above-mentioned reconstructed hymn 4.

Dactylic hexameters (apart from line 1): guide edition: Pr; cf. MT² for I 315–25.

- 1 Ἄναξ Απόλλων, ἔλθε | σὺν Παιήονι,
 χρημάτισόν μοι, περὶ ὧν ἄξιῶ, κύριε.
 δέσποτα, | λίπε Παρνάσ{σ}ιον ὄρος καὶ Δελφίδα Πυθὼ |
 ἡμετέρων ἱερῶν στομάτων ἄφθεγκτα λαλούντων, |
 5 ἄγγελε πρῶτε (θε)οῦ, Ζηνὸς μέγαλοιο, Ἴάω, (300)
 καὶ σὲ τὸν οὐράνιον κόσμον κατέχοντα, Μιχαήλ,
 καὶ σὲ καλῶ, Γαβριήλ πρω|τάγγελε· δεῦρ’ ἀπ’ Ὀλύμπου,
 Ἀβραάξ, ἀντολῆς κεχαρη|μένος, ἵλαος ἔλθοις,
 ὃς δύσιν ἀντολήθεν ἐπισκοπιάζει[ς, Ἀ]δωναί· |

² I.10–16. Also annotated by Faraone 2004, especially 224–31.

HYMN TO APOLLO

- 10 πᾶσα φύσις τρομ[έ]ει σε, πάτερ κό[σ]μοιο, πακερβηθ. |
 ὀρκίζω κεφαλὴν τε θεοῦ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν Ὀλυμπος, | (305)
 ὀρκίζω σφραγίδα θεοῦ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὄρασις, |
 ὀρκίζω χέρα δεξιτερὴν, ἣν κόσμῳ ἐπέσχες, |
 ὀρκίζω κρητῆρα θεοῦ πλουτοῦν κατέχοντα, |
 15 ὀρκίζω θεὸν αἰώνιον αἰῶνά τε πάντων, |
 ὀρκίζω φύσιν αὐτοφυῆ, κράτιστον ἄδωναῖον, | (310)
 ὀρκίζω δύνοντα καὶ ἀντέλλοντα ἑλωαῖον, |
 ὀρκίζω τὰ ἅγια καὶ θεῖα ὀνόματα ταῦτα, ὅπως | ἂν πέμψωσί
 μοι τὸ θεῖον
 πνεῦμα καὶ τελέση | ἃ ἔχω κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν. |
 20 κλυθι, μάκαρ, κλήζω σε, τὸν οὐρανοῦ ἡγεμονῆα | (315)
 καὶ γαίης, χάεός τε καὶ Ἀῖδος, ἔνθα νέμονται . . . |
 πέμψον δαίμονα τοῦτον ἐμαῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπαιδαῖς |
 νυκτὸς ἐλαυνόμενον προστάγμασι σῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης, |
 οὐπερ ἀπὸ σκήνους ἐστὶ τόδε, καὶ φρα{ς}σάτω μοι, |
 25 ὅσσα θέλω γνῶμῃσιν, ἀληθείην καταλέξας, | (320)
 πρηῦν, μελίχιον μηδ' ἀντία μοι φρονέοντα. |
 μηδὲ σὺ μηνίσῃς ἐπ' ἐμαῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπαιδαῖς, |
 ἀλλὰ φύλαξον ἅπαν δέμας ἄρκιον ἐς φάος ἐλθεῖν. |
 ταῦτα γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔταξας ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δαῖναι. |
 30 κλήζω δ' οὐνομα σὸν Μοίραις αὐταῖς ἰσάριθμον· | (325)
 ἀχαῖφωθωθαῖηῖαῖα αἰηαῖηῖαω|θωθωφιαχα
- ἴλαθί μοι, προπάτωρ, | προγενέστερε, αὐτογένεθλε·
 ὀρκίζω τὸ πῦρ | τὸ φανέν πρῶτον ἐν ἀβύσσῳ, |
 ὀρκίζω τὴν σὴν δύναμιν, τὴν πᾶσι μεγίστην, |
 35 ὀρκίζω τὸν φθείροντα μέχρις Ἀῖδος εἶσω, | (345)
 ἵνα ἀπέλθῃς εἰς τὰ ἴδια πρυμνήσια καὶ μὴ |
 με βλάβῃς, ἀλλ' εὐμενὴς γενοῦ διὰ παντός.

5 πρωτε του, P 8 καχαρη, P 9 εσ δυσιν αντολιhs, P: ος,
 Pr following *PGM* III 220 (see 3.23); the correction ἀντολίηθεν is
 not strictly necessary, as the prefix-preposition ἐπί could govern the
 genitive 12 σφρακιδα, P 26 μελικιον μηδ' αντια μη,
 P 28 ἄρκιον, MT; ἄρτιον Pr, following *PGM* IV 1976 (see
 2.18B) 29 εδαξας, P 30 εις αριθμον, P 31 αχαῖφωθωθ-
 ωααῖηῖαῖα, P 35 μεχρεις, P

HYMN 1

Translation

- Lord Apollo, come with Paian,
 give me a response about what I ask, lord.
 Master, leave Mount Parnassus and the Delphic Pytho
 as our sacred mouths utter secret words;
- 5 O first messenger of the god, of great Zeus, *ΙΑΩ*,
 and you, who occupy heavenly cosmos, *MICHAËL*,
 and you I call, *GABRIËL*, first messenger;
ABRASAX, rejoicing in dawns, may you come here propitious from
 Olympos,
 you who observe sunset from dawn, *ADŌNAI*;
 10 all nature quivers in front of you, father of the cosmos, *PAKERBĒTH*.
 I adjure (by) god's head, which is Olympos,
 I adjure god's seal, which is vision,
 I adjure the right hand that you held upon the cosmos,
 I adjure god's krater which contains wealth,
- 15 I adjure eternal god, *ΑΙΩΝ* of everything,
 I adjure self-growing nature, mightiest *ADŌNAIOS*,
 I adjure setting and rising *ELŌAIOS*,
 I adjure these sacred and divine names so that they send me the
 divine spirit
 and that it fulfils what I have in my heart and mind.
- 20 Listen, blessed one, I call you ruler of the sky
 and earth and chaos and Hades, where dwell . . .
 Send this daimon to my sacred charms
 who, by night, is driven by orders from your constraint,
 to whose corpse this belongs and may he tell me
- 25 everything I want in my mind, telling the truth,
 and send him gentle, benevolent, not thinking anything against me.
 And may you not be indignant at my sacred charms
 but mind the whole body comes to light 'effective';
 for you yourself arranged these things among mankind for them to
 learn.
- 30 I call your name equal in number to the very *Moirai*,
ACHAIPHŌTHŌTHŌAIËIAËIA AIËAIËIAŌTHŌTHŌPHIACHA.
- Be propitious to me, first father, elder one, self-engendered;
 I adjure the fire which first appeared in the abyss,

COMMENTARY

- 35 I adjure your power, which is greatest over everything,
I adjure the one who destroys as far as in Hades,
so that you leave towards your hawsers (i.e. for your own anchorage)
and you do not
harm me, but be totally benevolent.

COMMENTARY

1 Ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων: Ἄναξ is a common epithet of Apollo found throughout Greek literature, though not frequent in this specific iambic sequence.³ The term in itself is quite neutral and not exclusive to this deity or any other.

Παιήωνι: Epic form of Παῖάν/Παιών. It is not clear whether Homer already uses Paeon/Paeon as an epithet of Apollo – which is customary practice after him – or still perceives this ‘physician of the gods’ as an independent personality. Also found in connection with Asclepius, the epithet means ‘healer’, and then ‘saviour’ from any kind of evil.⁴ Since in our hymn Apollo has to come ‘with’, σύν, Paian, the epithet seems to serve as a personification underlining some of Apollo’s competences and meaning ‘come with your healing and saving skills’.

2 As is well known, Apollo is the god of prophecy *par excellence*. His oracle in Delphi was the most famous one (already attested in Hom. *Od.* 8.80) but there were many others throughout Greece and Asia Minor.⁵ Thus, asking Apollo to prophesy perfectly fits the role of this deity in Greek tradition. What is new, and typical of magical literature, is the statement that the

³ E.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 801, *Ch.* 559; Soph. *Aj.* 703; Bacchyl. *Epin.* 3.76, 13.115.

⁴ Von Blumenthal, *RE* ‘Paian’; Käppel, *NP* ‘Paian’; Graf 2009, 81–4; Rutherford 2001a, 10–17. In the *OH*, apart from Asclepius (67.1) and Apollo (34.1), various deities can be Παῖάν (8.12, 11.11, 52.11): see Morand 2001, 161–3. Cf. Bernand 1969, 583, no. 167, line 1; cf. **Intro.** pp. 33–4. Cf. also III 236, 250, 258 for Παῖάν in the fragmentary hymn to Apollo (see **Intro.** p. 54). See also Rutherford 2013 for Paeon in the Getty Hexameters (see **Intro.** pp. 34–5).

⁵ E.g. Johnston 2008, 33–89; Graf 2009, 52–78; Parke 1985.

god has to give a response *περὶ ὧν ἄξιῶ*, which, like the more common *περὶ τοῦ δεῖνα πράγματος*, ‘about the NN matter’, would seem a way to leave a ‘blank space’ that can be filled according to the occasion.

χρημάτισόν μοι: This imperative appears in the *PGM* within lamp divinations or dream oracles, and thus it does not seem connected with only one specific procedure.⁶

κύριε: This common epithet of gods was widely adopted by Jews and Christians to address Yahweh or Christ (but also God) respectively and, in apposition in the vocative referring to a deity, is almost exclusively used in these milieus. In the *PGM* it can appear in various combinations, some of them clearly originating in the Septuagint such as ὁ κύριος θεὸς τῶν Ἑβραίων, ‘the Lord God of the Hebrews’, κύριος παντοκράτωρ, ‘Lord almighty’,⁷ or the pairing κύριε–δέσποτα of our hymn.⁸ At the same time the epithet is typical of Hellenistic sovereigns and, when applied to gods, is especially common in Egypt. Similarly, the *PGM* use it for various deities, e.g. Asclepius, Hermes, Helios, Sarapis and ‘gods’ in the plural.⁹ This makes it clear that, in spite of its Judaeo-Christian¹⁰ popularity, κύριος remained generic, as it was in classical Greek literature. Similarly, its Egyptian equivalent *nb*, ‘lord’, is extremely common for most gods.¹¹

3 δέσποτα: Common epithet of gods attested in relation to different deities, such as Zeus, Poseidon, Dionysus, Helios,

⁶ IV, 951, 2498, VII, 248, 253, XXXa, 2, LXII, 35.

⁷ XXIIb 18 (see LXX, e.g. *Ex.* 7.16.1–2, 9.1.2, 10.3.2–3); XII 250, LXXI 3 (cf. LXX, *passim*, especially κύριε παντοκράτωρ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ, see 3.21).

⁸ E.g. LXX, *Ge.* 15.8.2, *Ju.* 5.20.1, 11.10.1, *Jn.* 4.3.2, *Je.* 1.6.2, 4.10.1.

⁹ Williger, *RE* ‘Kyrios’; e.g. VII 640, VIII 2–4, I 229, IV 1933, XXXIb 1, III 171, VII 707; *OGIS* 697; *SEG* 35.1051.

¹⁰ For the sake of conciseness Judaeo-Christian means Jewish and Christian.

¹¹ LSJ, B.3; Frenschkowski, *RAC* ‘Kyrios’, especially A–I.c, A–III; Choat 2006, 108–13; Rees 1950, 94; *LGG* III.557–8, see 558–826 for the very many epithets starting with *nb*.

Asclepius, etc.,¹² and, like κύριος, very frequent also in Judaeo-Christian literature as a synonym for 'God'.¹³ Similarly, within the *PGM* it is found in connection with various deities and, as in earlier literature, not necessarily 'supreme' ones. The epithet can be used in two ways: on its own or followed by a genitive specifying the field of authority of the god. For example, Apollo-Helios-Horus can be called δέσποτα Μουσῶν, 'master/lord of the Muses',¹⁴ δέσποτα κόσμου, 'master of the cosmos',¹⁵ or just δέσποτα, 'master'.¹⁶ In the last case the term seems to be general as we can find it with very varied gods, e.g. Cronus, Hermes, Osiris, Aion, 'God of the Hebrews' or even daimons or spirits of the dead.¹⁷ Similarly, a combination such as δέσποτα Μουσῶν, which is specific in itself, can be applied to any deity by changing the second term according to the field of competence.¹⁸ The situation is different for δέσποτα κόσμου, or δέσποτα τοῦ παντός, which are consistently used in passages where the gods are described as creators with universalistic connotations.¹⁹ In conclusion, the appearance of δεσπότης alone cannot tell us much about the nature of a deity.

λίπε Πarnά[σ]σιον ὄρος καὶ Δελφίδα Πυθώ: Two typical toponyms of the Apollonian mythology: Mount Parnassus, near the city of Delphi, considered sacred to the god,²⁰ and Pytho, older name of the region of Delphi.²¹

¹² E.g. Aesop. *Fab.* 49.1.6; Pind. *Ol.* 6.103; Eur. *Ba.* 582; *OH* 8.16, 67.1.

¹³ Cf. Hagedorn and Worp 1980; Makris, *NP* 'Despotes'.

¹⁴ E.g. II 165. Although it may sound odd in some combinations, I keep the translation 'master' in order to distinguish the use of δεσπότης and κύριος, 'lord'.

¹⁵ E.g. IV 446, 460, 1966 (2.10, 23A).

¹⁶ E.g. II 178, 181, IV 1943, XXXVI, 227.

¹⁷ E.g. III 415, IV 253, 3106, V 209, VII 443, 449, 610, XII 306, XIII 709, XXIIIb 23-4.

¹⁸ E.g. Helios δέσποτα ἀντολῆς, III 210 (3.13); Helios-Mithras δέσποτα ὕδατος, IV 714.

¹⁹ E.g. IV 1164, 3122 (cf. *OH* 8.16), XII 239, 250 (9.11).

²⁰ E.g. *HH* 3.269, 282.

²¹ E.g. *HH* 3.183, 372; Nonn. *Dion.* 9.251: Δελφίδα Πυθώ.

4 ἡμετέρων ἱερῶν στομάτων:²² The phrase must refer to the lips of the performer(s) so that ἄφθεγκτα, literally ‘voiceless things’, ‘things that cannot be spoken’, has to designate a sort of secret knowledge expressed by what follows in the hymn. The god has to come because of this knowledge and not as the result of a pious act of veneration.²³

5–10 This passage is slightly ambiguous, since it is not immediately clear whether the divine names and epithets listed have to be understood as attributes of Apollo or as separate entities invoked by the magician. The passage (down to verse 19), with all its references to the Judaeo-Christian milieu, is probably a later interpolation, which would explain the discrepancy with the previous and following sections, but this does not mean that, for whoever wrote the preserved version of the hymn, it did not make sense. Keeping this in mind, the anaphora of καὶ σέ seems to suggest that different divine entities are invoked (at least until line 7), which would fit with lines 11–18 and with πέμψωσι (line 18), third person plural, clearly stating that the subjects that are supposed to send the ‘divine spirit’ are more than one. But in line 8 ἵλαος ἔλθοις is singular, and lines 8–10 seem to refer back to the solar Apollo. The question is easily resolved if we consider that in the *PGM* the use of the plural does not necessarily mean that more deities are involved; in fact different divine names, ‘divine entities’, or *voces magicae* can be conceived as different forms of a single god though maintaining a separate identity, and if a ‘name’ is considered to be ‘powerful’ it can be added even if it disturbs the coherence of the text.²⁴ Not by chance does line 18 specify that the magician adjured ‘these sacred and divine names’ and not deities, and for example the ‘father of the

²² For ἱερῶν στομάτων see Ps.-Manetho, *Apotel.* 5.13, referring to the ‘sacred lips’ of Homer.

²³ Szepes 1976, 207: feature differentiating the magical hymns from the *OH*; cf. Morand 2001, 147–50.

²⁴ Cf. Daniel 1983, 153–4.

cosmos' (line 10) is unlikely to be a deity other than the supreme god protagonist of the hymn. The slightly different parallel in 3.14–17, 23, apart from confirming that this passage was part of a separate hymn, reinforces this interpretation since in that context it is even harder to imagine the different names conceived as separate deities.

5 ἄγγελε πρῶτε (θε)οῦ: Even if we want to keep a neutral rendering and translate ἄγγελος with 'messenger', all attestations of this word, with πρῶτος or θεοῦ referring to a divine being, belong to the Judaeo-Christian milieu. The πρῶτος ἄγγελος can be Satan, or better Satanael, before being cast out of Heaven, or usually Michael.²⁵ In the hymn, the 'first messenger' is the messenger of 'the great Zeus'. Traditionally, various 'entities' can be called 'messengers of Zeus': the eagle, as animal or constellation, a personified dream and deities such as Iris and especially Hermes.²⁶ However, here they are clearly all out of place because no further mention is made of any of them, and the 'messenger', apart from being πρῶτος, appears in a list of deities that cannot be related to the traditional messengers of Zeus in any way. It has to be concluded that here the phrase Ζηνὸς μέγαλοιο, patterned on the epic Διὸς μέγαλοιο, does not refer to the Olympian god as a specific mythological personality, but stands for the 'supreme deity', providing a 'Hellenistic' explanation for that otherwise vague θεοῦ originally meant to be simply 'God'. The same applies to Διὸς in the parallel verse in 3.14, πρῶτιστον Διὸς ἄγγελον.

Ἰάω: Greek rendering of the name of the Hebrew God ὕμνῃ which in magical texts obtained enough autonomy to

²⁵ E.g. Hermas, *Pastor* 12.1.3. Satanael, Beelzeboul: e.g. *Ev. Barth.* fr. 4.28; *Testam. Salom.* 25.10–12, 108.13. Michael: e.g. *Testam. Abrahæ* (B) 4.10–11; *Apoc. apocr. Jo.* (versio tertia) 317.10; Chrysipp. *Encom. in Mich.* 88.20. For this and the following angelic names in magic, Fauth 1983, 75–96.

²⁶ E.g. Bacchyl. *Epín.* 5.19, *Dith.* 5.30; Arat. *Phæn.* 1.523; Hom. *Il.* 2.26, 63, 24.169–73; *HH* 4.3; Eur. *El.* 461, *IA* 1302.

be considered as a separate deity.²⁷ As a name of Yahweh, it would better fit Zeus, but, considering that in the following five lines every invoked deity has a special name, Iao must be the name of the ‘first messenger’. This is confirmed by the parallel in 3.14, where Iao is modified by the adjective *θεῖον* (accusative). In Gnosticism Iao can be one of the seven archons connected with the seven planets together with Adonaios and Eloaios (see line 9, 16–17, and 4.1, 3).²⁸

6 Since *κόσμος* can mean ‘universe’ but also refer to the firmament as opposed to the earth, or to the earth as opposed to the heaven,²⁹ the adjective *οὐράνιος* seems to specify that Michael abides in the sky. The line is paralleled in 3.15.

6–7 *Μιχαήλ, Γαβριήλ*: Michael and Gabriel are two of the most important angels first in Jewish and then in Christian religious tradition.³⁰ Their attestations in magical amulets and in the *PGM* suggest that in Graeco-Egyptian magic they were often stripped of their original connotation and were used as secret names of the invoked gods (which is generally true also for the other divine names of Hebrew or Assyro-Babylonian origin).³¹ As already mentioned, Michael is usually the *πρῶτος ἄγγελος* of God. There are few attestations of the title attributed to Gabriel but in any case not before the seventh

²⁷ BG; Aune, *RAC* ‘Iao’; Perdrizet 1928, 76–7; Bohak 2003, 71; Mastrocinque 2003, 102. In general, on the analogies among the *PGM*, *Sefer ha-Razim* and the Hekhalot writings, Lesses 1996; Schäfer 1990. Cf. **Intro.** p. 34.

²⁸ Cf. Orig. *Cels.* 6.31; Michl, *RAC* ‘Engel’ 103, 202 no. 8, 203 no. 9, 212 no. 73, 216 no. 102. Cf. Dieterich 1891, 39–48. On the use of this and other similar Hebrew names in the *PGM* see Bohak 2008, 197–201.

²⁹ LSJ IV.

³⁰ Caquot 1971, 133, 137, 140; on angels in antiquity, Michl, *RAC* ‘Engel’ 53–258, 239–51 (Michael and Gabriel).

³¹ Often associated with supreme solar deities, with Anubis and Thoth (with whom they shared the function of the psychopomp), or with astral bodies: e.g. DD, nos. 116, 127; Hopfner 1974–90, I.64–82; Kákosy 1989, 266. See also Bohak in **I** n.28.

century, which suggests that the author of the hymn was not well acquainted with Judaeo-Christian theology.³²

σὲ καλῶ: Very rare invocational pattern (cf. **Intro.** p. 30).³³
7–9 This section, apart from the presence of two *voces magicae*, seems to refer back to the Olympic Apollo. Considering that Homer treats Phoibos-Apollo and Helios as two separate entities, it is not certain whether Apollo was originally a solar deity or not. Nevertheless, from the fifth century BC the god acquired solar connotations, becoming the rider of the sun's chariot, and was often equated with Helios.³⁴

ἀντολῆς κεχαρημένος: Quite obscure but clarified by the parallel in 3.16, ἀντολῆς χαίρων.

Ἰλαος ἔλθοις: Variation of the Homeric Ἰλαος ἔστω, 'may he be propitious'. The use of ἔλθοις/ἐλθέ (cf. 1.1) and other desiderative/imperative expressions urging the deity to appear at the celebration in his honour is typical of Greek hymnography and was also largely adopted by magical hymns where the deity is supposed to 'come' to the magician either in a vision or in the flesh.³⁵

8 Ἀβρασάξ: Very common magical word that may derive from the Hebrew *arba*, 'four' (probably in relation to the tetragrammaton YHWH expressing the name of God), with the addition of other letters in order to obtain – following the principle

³² E.g. Theophanes Continuatus, 325.13; Christophorus, *Carm.* 61.2. For the important place held by Michael in Coptic Christian tradition see van Esbroeck, 'Michael the archangel' in Atiya 1991.

³³ E.g. II 101 (7.33), 139, IV 261, 2725 (14.9), V 97; Aristoph. *Lys.* 346; *OH* 50.10, 55.28.

³⁴ Detschew, *RAC* 'Apollon', 527; Wernicke, *RE* 'Apollon', 19–21; Jessen, *RE* 'Helios', especially 75–6; Graf, *NP* 'Apollon' 867; Graf 2009, 145–53; Boyancé 1966. The first certain attestation appears in Eur. *Phaeth.* 224–6 (Diggle 1970, 147–8 *ad loc.*).

³⁵ Hom. *Il.* 19.178; cf. 3.16. See Furley and Bremer 2001, I.61, 6.2.2, and 4.5–7 to be compared with the whole passage: Anacreon's poem to Dionysus, *PMG* 357.6–8, σὺ δ' εὐμενῆς | ἔλθοις μοι, κεχαρισμένης | δ' εὐχολῆς ἐπακούειν, 'graciously join me, take pleasure in my prayer and fulfill it'. Cf. 6.2–3 for similar patterns in Egyptian spells.

of *gematria* – the numeric value 365: $1+2+100+1+200+1+60 = 365$, the days of the solar year, expressing ‘the infinite’, ‘eternity’.³⁶ In Graeco-Egyptian amulets, it is often used to define a hybrid deity (probably of Jewish origin) with a cock’s head, a human torso and two snakes substituting for the legs. It seems this so-called anguipede originated as a pictorial representation of a name of the God of Israel mixed with solar traits.³⁷ Apart from Ἀβρασάξ, it can be named in different ways: among the commonest we find Iao, Michael, Adoneu/Adone/Adonai and Gabriel.³⁸

9 The phrase, apart from evoking the solar journey, could allude to the omniscience of the god: his sight from above is able to cover all the space from dawn to sunset, from east to west, meaning that he sees everything.³⁹ This idea of the all-seeing omniscient solar god is well attested in Greek literature starting from Homer where Helios is the one ὃς πάντ’ ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ’ ἐπακούει, ‘who sees and hears everything from above’.⁴⁰ In the Egyptian solar hymnography it is especially connected with the omnipresence of the light in which the deity manifests himself: as the sunlight reaches every place, the sun god can see everywhere. He is ‘the one who sees much, whose movements know no limits’; ‘there are no limits to the field of his vision’; ‘just as he

³⁶ BG; Dornseiff 1988, 91–6, 105; cf. Bohak 2008, 247–50.

³⁷ Le Glay, *LMC* ‘Abraxas’; Bonner 1950, 123–39, rejecting the possibility of a Gnostic origin of the anguiped; DD, 23–42; Michel 2001, 59–64; Michel 2004, 106–13; Koenig 2009. On the Jewish origin see Nagy 2002, with extensive bibliography; cf. Mastrocinque 2003, 66–7, 84–90, 100. On the problem of the origin of the type see Quack, in press. Cf. Darnell 2004, 387–90, though not convincing; see Quack 2005b, 40.

³⁸ E.g. DD, nos. 3–15, 18, 21, 22, 24–5, 27–30, etc.

³⁹ E.g. Posidon. fr. 290a.195–6 (Theiler), who says that the longitude of the whole inhabited world corresponds to the course of the sun from dawn to sunset: μήκος μὲν γὰρ τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης τὸ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς πρὸς δύνιν ἐστί.

⁴⁰ E.g. *Il.* 3.277, *Od.* 11.109; West 1978, *ad Hes. Op.* 267. Cf. Isidorus, *Hym.* 3.26–7 (Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.*); *OH* 61.8.

sails north, so does he sail south, viewing that which he made, his two divine eyes illuminating the Two Lands'.⁴¹ The omniscience of the supreme god can also be expressed by iconographical means in those representations of polymorphic deities having their bodies covered with eyes (see line 11 and **Intro.** p. 48).⁴² On the other hand, the phrase could be the result of a distortion of ὅς δὺσιν ἀντολήσιν ἐπισκεπάζεις, 'you who hide sunset with dawns' (3.23). In that case, it would refer both to the pervasive light and to the cyclicity of the sun's journey: the disappearance of the sun at sunset is nullified every day by its rising.

Ἄ]δωναί: Hebrew name of God meaning 'my Lord' used because of the prohibition against pronouncing the real name of God, Yahweh. Also one of the seven Gnostic archons (see 4.1, 3).⁴³
ἰο πᾶσα φύσις τρομ[έ]ει σε: The idea of Nature reacting at the presence of the deity is well attested in Greek literature. First, in the *HH* to Apollo, where at the birth of the god the earth smiles and the island of Delos turns to gold blossoming with flowers. Similarly, Callimachus describes how, at the epiphany of Apollo, his shrine and the laurel tremble, the palm tree nods and the swans start singing sweetly. As far as we can tell from Himerius' prose summary, in Alcaeus' hymn to Apollo there were nightingales, swallows and cicadas singing at the god's arrival, the Castalian spring flowing silver and the level of the Cephissus rising dramatically.⁴⁴ However, in most cases, Nature tends to react to the god's epiphany with

⁴¹ P. Berlin 3049, XVII.6; P. Louvre 3292, H.2; Hibis, Klotz 2006, IV.26–7; Assmann 1995, 76–7, 185; Pettazzoni 1955a, especially 16–17; Pettazzoni 1955b, 70–106, 223–39; cf. Brunner-Traut 1977; Wiebach-Koepke 2003.

⁴² E.g. Kákosy 2002, 278; Puech 1930, 422; cf. the Harris magical papyrus in Leitz 1999, VII.6–7 (Lange 1927), where the all-seeing supreme god has 77 eyes and 77 ears, and Amun with 777 ears and millions of eyes at Hibis: Klotz 2006, 167–70. Cf. Pettazzoni 1938.

⁴³ See **I** n.28.

⁴⁴ *HH* 3.118 (Richardson 2010, *ad loc.* and 134–9), 135–9; Callim. *Hym.* 2.1–5 (Williams 1978, *ad loc.*), 4.249–63 (Mineur 1984, *ad loc.*); Himer. *Or.* 48 (Furley and Bremer 2001, I.99–102, II.21–4). Cf. also Pind. fr. 52m.14–20 (*Pa.* XII), see Rutherford 1988, 70–3.

joy or with an outburst of productivity,⁴⁵ while fear is reserved for human beings. Men fear and tremble at the presence of gods as 'it is difficult to look at them when they manifest themselves' and sometimes even the gods themselves can tremble at the arrival of another deity.⁴⁶ Some exceptions are found either in conjunction with particular events (such as the birth of Athena, when Olympos trembled, the earth cried with fear and the sea turned stormy),⁴⁷ or with specific divine attributes (wild beasts, and in its turn Nature, are terrified by Artemis the dreadful huntress who will chase and destroy them).⁴⁸ Otherwise, they are circumstantial, and thus limited to precise areas and directly caused by the god (Apollo shakes the ship of the Cretans and makes the timbers quiver),⁴⁹ or they use the trembling of Nature to describe an earthquake.⁵⁰ This system of images implies that these gods have specific areas of competence so that all the cosmos can be affected by the presence of one of them only in extraordinary situations. On the contrary, the less personal and more 'supreme' the god becomes, the more universally Nature responds to his epiphany. In the Septuagint the earth trembles and the water fears at the presence of God,⁵¹ and in an 'Orphic' fragment, which probably contains a Judaeo-Hellenistic hymn attributed to Orpheus only in order to foster the monotheistic faith among pagans, in front of the one god 'the eternal hills tremble as they cannot sustain his mighty power'.⁵²

⁴⁵ E.g. *HH* 2.13–14, 7.34–42; Theogn. *Eleg.* 9; Limenius, *Paean* 7.

⁴⁶ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 20.130–1; *Od.* 24.533–5; *HH* 2.190, 293 (Richardson 1974, *ad* 188–90, 13), 3.2 (Richardson 2010, *ad loc.*), 447, 28.6–7.

⁴⁷ *HH* 28.9–13; Pind. *Ol.* 7.38.

⁴⁸ *HH* 27.6–10; Callim. *Hym.* 4.137–40. ⁴⁹ *HH* 3.403; *Il.* 13.18–19.

⁵⁰ E.g. Eur. *Ba.* 585 (the earthquake phenomenon is likely to underlie most of the previous examples too).

⁵¹ E.g. LXX, *Ps.* 77.16–18, 96.9, 97.4–6, 114.7.

⁵² Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 378.32–3. Following the tradition according to which Orpheus would have become a monotheist at the end of his life: Jourdan 2010, especially 163–70, also 189–90 for other parallels; cf. West 1983, 33–5. Cf. also Seaford 1997; Radcliffe 2011, 74–6.

The same idea of cosmic awe in response to the god's arrival is common in Egyptian tradition, where the supreme gods can bear titles such as *nb-snd*, 'the lord of fearsomeness', or *ʿ3-šfyt*, 'great of reverential fear'. The theme already appears in the Pyramid Texts and becomes especially detailed in the so-called *snd* exhortations of the Ptolemaic temples (see 3.1–8).⁵³

πάτερ κό[σ]μοιο: The god is the creator of the cosmos.⁵⁴ Originally a common epithet of Zeus as father of gods and men,⁵⁵ attested also for Helios in connection with pre-Socratic speculations,⁵⁶ *πατήρ* is found for example in Plato's *Timaeus* together with *ποιητής* to describe the demiurge, the 'cause' responsible for the creation of the universe (τοῦ παντός).⁵⁷ In Jewish and Christian literature it becomes a common alternative for 'God' though not frequently in the collocation *πατήρ κόσμου*, probably owing to the 'pagan' connotation acquired by *κόσμος* in comparison to *παῖς*.⁵⁸ On the other hand, Egyptian creator deities, especially Amun, can bear epithets such as *km3-ntt*, 'who created everything that exists', or *ms-ntt(-nbt)*, 'who generated everything that exists', where the verb *ms*

⁵³ E.g. Pyr. 509, 924, 2109, 143a. Various Egyptian examples of cosmic awe at the divine epiphany are discussed by Hornung 1996, 128–35. For the epithets see *LGG* III.734–5 (*nb-snd*), II.44–6 (*ʿ3-šfyt*).

⁵⁴ Cf. IV 1170, 1182 (Helios), 1989 (2.25B); XXIIb 4 ('God of the Hebrews').

⁵⁵ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 4.235, 11.201; *HH* 2.321; Archil. fr. 25.6 (West); Pind. *Pyth.* 3.98; Eur. *Med.* 1352.

⁵⁶ Soph. *TrGF* fr. 752: "Ἡλι' ... ὃν οἱ σοφοὶ λέγουσι γεννητὴν θεῶν | πατέρα τε πάντων, 'Helios ... the sages say that you are the begetter of the gods and the father of all' (but πάντων could be masculine, 'father of everybody' and the passage could refer again to the standard epithet of Zeus 'father of gods and men').

⁵⁷ *Ti.* 28c; cf. Plu. *Plat.* 1000E10–1001C4.

⁵⁸ Monteverocchi 1957, 409–11; e.g. Philo, *De vita Mosis* 2.134.1, 238.2; Philo, *De spec.* 1.96.5; Euseb. *PE* 3.10.4.1. Cf. Rees 1950, 97–8. Also, Sarapis can be addressed as 'father,' probably owing to his benevolent aspect of 'saviour': Stambaugh 1972, 47–8; e.g. *SB* 1.1046, 3731.

means literally ‘to give birth’ (see 2.22A, *αὐτολόχευτε*).⁵⁹ ‘Father’ is also used to underline the primordially of creator gods, especially in the common epithet *ἰτ-ἰτω*, ‘father of fathers’ (see line 32).

πακερβηθ: Magical word often appearing in connection with Seth-Typhon and in the sequence *ιωερβηθ ιωπακερβηθ ιωβολχοσηθ*. In its commonest interpretation, though phonetically problematic, it would come from Egyptian and mean ‘the evil doer’. Even if it is usually a Sethian word, it can also be found in solar contexts.⁶⁰ Szepes, considering the importance of alliteration as a form of repetition in magic, suggested that the alliteration of the *πα* present in the verse would be the reason underlying the choice of *πακερβηθ*.⁶¹

11–18 From the Greek it is not clear whether the magician is adjuring separate entities or the same god ‘by’ various titles. Even if the second hypothesis would seem more plausible, it has to be discarded since line 18, ‘I adjure these sacred and divine names so that they send me the divine spirit’, makes it clear that the previous list is the subject of the action. Apart from possible earlier interpolations, the present state of the hymn tells us that the magician directly adjures a series of ‘divine names’. Sometimes they are names (lines 15–17), sometimes they are body parts or objects. They are conceived as separate from the god (‘they’ have to send the divine spirit), but at the same time they are all symbolic of the same god – for example, the ‘eternal god, Aion of everything’ is unlikely to be a deity other than the supreme god invoked by the hymn (see lines 5–10).

11 This verse alludes to the cosmic nature of the god whose head is Olympus, i.e. the sky. Only the head is mentioned here, but in other *PGM* passages the supreme god is described

⁵⁹ *LGG* VII.196 (*km3-ntt*), III.406 (*ms-ntt-nbt*); e.g. P. Cairo 58032, 21; P. Cairo 58038, III.6.2–3.

⁶⁰ BG; Hopfner 1974–90, II.1.229–32; Bonner 1950, 163–4; Daniel 1983, 151–2.

⁶¹ Szepes 1976, 210.

equating his different body parts with different regions of the cosmos;⁶² thus we can be sure that the same idea underlies this verse and that ‘Olympos’ does not refer here to the traditional seat of the gods but is used instead of ‘sky’. The idea of a supreme god whose body is the cosmos, and thus the elimination of the dualism ‘creating principle’/‘created matter’, had been elaborated especially by the Stoics (at least starting from Chrysippus),⁶³ but they never expressed it in such anthropomorphic terms.⁶⁴ In Greek literature, the most striking parallels to these descriptions come from two specific milieus: the Orphic literature and the cult of Sarapis.⁶⁵ One example is the oracle supposedly given by Sarapis identified with ‘the Sun’ to Nicocreon of Salamis around 321–311 BC,⁶⁶ the other is an Orphic hymn, quoted partially or completely by various authors, which describes Zeus not only as the supreme creator of the universe, but as the universe itself.⁶⁷ This cosmic

⁶² XII 243: ‘Heaven is your head; ether, body; earth, feet; and the water around you, ocean, O Agathos Daimon’; similarly XIII 771–3, XXI, 5–7.

⁶³ Meijer 2007, especially 30–3, 54, 66–77, 100–9, 126–8, 150–1, 207; Long 2006, 258–60, 268–70; cf. Algra 2009. Even if Cleanthes’ hymn to Zeus never states that the god is the cosmos but rather that he is a ruling principle in the cosmos. Also Rendall 1921.

⁶⁴ Cf. Plato, *Ti.* 33c–34a: the creator is conceived as separated from his creation, but, in order to explain the self-sufficiency and all-including unity of the cosmos described as a living creature, its anthropomorphism is explicitly denied.

⁶⁵ See the thorough analysis of MT, I.127–34, 142–7.

⁶⁶ Macrobian. *Satum.* 1.20.16–7: οὐράνος κόσμος κεφαλή, γαστήρ δὲ θάλασσα, γαῖα δέ μοι πόδες εἰσί, τὰ δ’ οὐατ’ ἐν αἰθέρι κέϊται, ὄμμα δὲ τηλαυγὲς λαμπρὸν φάος ἡελίοιο, ‘The heavenly cosmos is my head, my belly is the sea, my feet are the earth, the ears are in the ether, my eye is the far-seen bright light of the sun’. Assmann 1979, 9. See Van den Broek 1978; Merkelbach 1995, 74–5.

⁶⁷ Porph. *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* 3.1–36 (Euseb. *PE* 3.9.2); cf. Stobaeus, 1.1.23. Partially quoted with some variants also in Plu. *De defect.* 436D9; Plu. *De commun.* 1074E3; Ps.-Aristot. *De mundo* 401a.27–401b.7; Procl. *Theol. Plat.* 6.40.3; Damascius, *In Parmenid.* 177; *Theosoph. Tubing.* 50; P. Derveni col. 17.12 (Bernabé 2004–7, 3, Appendix). See Bernabé 2004–7 fr. 31, 243. Here is the first half in the translation of Gifford 2002: ‘Zeus was the first, Zeus last, the lightning’s lord, / Zeus head, Zeus centre, all things are from

representation of Zeus is to be connected with the Orphic myth according to which Zeus, after having taken the place of his father Cronus, swallowed Phanes/Protogonus, the hermaphrodite god who had in himself the seed of all the gods, and thus ended up encompassing all the cosmos within himself.⁶⁸ Among the authors quoting the hymn, Eusebius of Caesarea comments that the doctrine expressed by the poet was Egyptian and ‘thought that the world was the god composed of many gods who were part of himself’.⁶⁹ On the other hand, an identification Sarapis-sun at the early date of the oracle of Nicocreon is very unlikely, which suggests either that the whole oracle is a later invention, or that the appearance of the name Sarapis is an *interpretatio graeca* for Amun, whose oracle at Siwa was popular in that period.⁷⁰ Whatever the case, even accepting the date and attribution of the oracle, *Wsir-Hp* was originally an Egyptian deity (see **Intro.** pp. 8–9).

Zeus. / Zeus born a male, Zeus maiden undefiled; / Zeus the firm base of earth and starry heaven; / Zeus sovereign, Zeus alone first cause of all: / one power divine, great ruler of the world, / one kingly form, encircling all things here, / fire, water, earth and ether, night and day; / Wisdom, first parent and delightful Love: / for in Zeus’ mighty body these all lie. / His head and beauteous face the radiant heaven / reveals, and round him float in shining waves / the golden tresses of the twinkling stars. / On either side bulls’ horns of gold are seen, / sunrise and sunset, footpaths of the gods. / His eyes the Sun, the Moon’s responsive light; / his mind immortal ether, sovereign truth, / hears and considers all.’ The hymn goes on equating other body parts of Zeus with the remaining ‘sections’ of the world: his torso is the air, his belly is the earth, his feet are the basis of the earth and the Tartarus. See Van den Broek 1978; cf. also Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 378; Bernabé 2010, especially 429–30, 440–1; Radcliffe 2011, 81.

⁶⁸ Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 140, 241; Guthrie 1993, especially 95–107; West 1983, 68–104, 218–20, 239–41; Radcliffe 2011, especially 78–83.

⁶⁹ Cf. Diod. Sic. 1.11.6–12.1; for Egyptian influences in Orphic conceptions see Hdt. 2.81; Diod. Sic. 1.23.2.3–10, 1.23.7, 1.96.4–5; West 1983, 105–6, 188–90, 198–202, 212–13.

⁷⁰ Nock 1934, especially 70; Welles 1962, especially 275–85, 292; cf. Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 1721–2; for the oracle of Amun, Kuhlmann 1988; on Sarapis see **Intro.** pp. 8–9.

The parallels from Egyptian hymnography collected by Assmann, and reproduced by MT,⁷¹ leave no doubt that Eusebius was not far from the truth when stating that the idea of the cosmic body of the deity had an Egyptian origin (in spite of his general misconception about Egyptian religion).⁷² Not surprisingly, these parallels originated in the Amun-Re theology from the Ramessid period onwards, in which the god is not only the creator of the cosmos but he 'is' the cosmos.⁷³ A few examples from hymns addressed to Amun-Re: 'His body is of air the sky is over his head . . . You are the sky, the earth and the Netherworld, you are the water, you are the air between them';⁷⁴ 'Your eyes are the sun and the moon, your head is the sky, your feet are the Netherworld.'⁷⁵ This conception of the cosmic god did not disappear after the Ramessid period; rather it spread with the following 'democratization of the divine supremacy', i.e. the trend thanks to which many gods can be thought to be supreme creators. Thus, in a hymn to Ptah (XXII Dynasty) assimilated to Amun under the influence of the Theban theology we find: 'Your feet are on the earth, your head is in the sky.'⁷⁶ In the illustrated Late period magical papyrus of the Brooklyn Museum, Bes-Pantheos is described as 'the giant of one million cubits' whose breath is the wind and whose saliva is the water.⁷⁷ It has been mentioned how Bes-Pantheos can be represented with leonine protomes (see 5.1), be covered with eyes (see line 9), wear a uraeus

⁷¹ Assmann 1979; see I n.65. See also Quack 2013, 239; Van den Broek 1978, 135–9.

⁷² Parallels are found also in Indian and Iranian texts: Assmann 1979, 8; Van den Broek 1978, 134–5.

⁷³ See **Intro.** p. 46.

⁷⁴ Hibis, Klotz 2006 III.5–6, 41.

⁷⁵ Piehl 1886, I.140, in Assmann 1983, no. 88.

⁷⁶ P. Berlin 3048, V.4. On the subject, also Sandman-Holmberg 1946, 166–73; Darnell 2004, 374–424, though quite problematic: see Quack 2005b, 39–43.

⁷⁷ Sauneron 1970, 4.3–5; cf. Louvre inv. E 11554 in Kákosy 2002, 278; cf. **Intro.** p. 48.

(see 5.1), stand on an ouroboros snake (see line 15 p. 81) and be encircled by flames (see line 33).⁷⁸

12 σφραγίδα θεοῦ: The ‘god’s seal’ may refer to the legend of the wise king Solomon in the *Testament of Solomon*,⁷⁹ possibly composed at the beginning of the third century. It tells the story of the foundation of the Temple of Jerusalem and narrates how Solomon succeeded in subduing to his will all the wandering malevolent demons, the last legacy of the pagan world, thanks to a ring engraved with the seal of God given to him by the archangel Michael. This legend became popular in magical circles, as demonstrated by magical amulets representing King Solomon riding a horse: the recurrent phrase carved on these gems is σφραγίς Θεοῦ.⁸⁰ The various versions of the *Testament of Solomon* do not agree on the nature of the seal of God: in one case it is a pentacle, but more often is a series of magical names among which Iao can appear.⁸¹ Similarly, in the *PGM* the seal of God sometimes seems to represent a powerful name of the deity or ‘the’ name of God, Yahweh.⁸² In any case, whether name or emblem, the seal of God clearly symbolized the deity itself.⁸³

ὅπερ ἐστὶν ὄρασις: This phrase remains obscure. It could mean that the seal of God, giving control over daimons, allows the magician ‘to see’, i.e. it helps the invoking procedure, or that it is an ‘apparition’ the magician is waiting for. On the other hand, if we take into consideration the passages

⁷⁸ See *Intro.* p. 48.

⁷⁹ McCown 1922; also Busch 2006; Klutz 2005.

⁸⁰ Cf. IV 3039; Bonner 1950, 209–10; DD, 261–4, nos. 369–73, 376–7; cf. Philo, *De Planat.* 18.3–19.2; NT *Apoc.* 7.2.3, 9.4.4, where the σφραγίς Θεοῦ is the mark of God protecting his bondservants; also Betz 1992, 96, no. 394; MT, II.75; Mastrocinque 2003, 63–4; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 231; cf. Perdrizet 1903; Bagatti 1971. For a medical interpretation of these magical gems see Dasen 2011, 72. For the use of seals in Jewish magic and the debate about their nature see Lesses 1996, 58.

⁸¹ Bohak 2008, 119; Perea Yébenes 2000, 19; Busch 2006, 84–93.

⁸² III 226 (see 3.29), VII 579–90, cf. XXXVI, 35–68; Dornseiff 1988, 107.

⁸³ On the seal as the means through which god gives form to matter see Philo, *De somn.* 2.45.1–46.1; as a symbol of power cf. *OH* 34.26, 64.2.

describing the cosmic body of the god (see line 11) we notice that, together with the head, feet and body, the eyes/eye are usually mentioned, i.e. the sun and the moon or just the sun.⁸⁴ This idea of the sun as the eye of god appears in other passages of the magical hymns and will be discussed later. Here I would argue that, considering the context, the word ὄρασις could be used in its first meaning of ‘seeing’, ‘act of sight’, and could refer to the eye of the god (as it does when in the plural is used for ‘eyes’).⁸⁵ The phrase would then be ‘the seal of god which is sight’, i.e. ‘your symbol/name which is sight’, i.e. ‘you who are omniscient’.⁸⁶

13 Possibly another originally Jewish image, given that in the Septuagint there are many references to ‘the hand of god’: the ‘hope of the world’ is governed by ‘the hand of god’, ‘God shall bring his hand upon the world (κόσμος) of heaven’,⁸⁷ etc. The ‘right hand of god’ is also found in the above-mentioned Judaeo-Hellenistic poem attributed to Orpheus:⁸⁸ the supreme god sits on his golden throne above heaven, plants his feet on the earth and extends his right hand over the ocean. This image resembles God’s self-description in the Septuagint: ‘heaven is my throne and earth the footstool of my feet’.⁸⁹ Though the motif of the hand of god seems thus connected with Jewish tradition, its mention in our hymn fits the anthropomorphic representation of the deity (see line 11).

In Egyptian tradition the hand of Atum was divinized as his female counterpart since it played a fundamental role in the process of creation through masturbation, ascribed to this deity in the theology of Heliopolis. Consequently, the title ‘the hand of god’ seems to belong to goddesses only. ‘Hand of Atum’ was also the name given to the hand of the so-called healing statues,

⁸⁴ See **I** n.66 and n.67. ⁸⁵ LSJ, 2.

⁸⁶ See line 9, **I** n.41 and n.42.

⁸⁷ LXX, *Sapient. Salom.* 14.6.3, *Is.* 24.21.2, and cf. *Ez.* 2.9 where the hand of God stretches from the sky towards the prophet. Cf. *Orac. Sib.* 8.302.

⁸⁸ See line 10 and **I** n.52: Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 378. ⁸⁹ *Is.* 66.1.1.

which was thought to have a special healing power: in some inscriptions we can find the phrase ‘this here is the hand of Atum which drives away the storm in the sky and the uproar in Heliopolis’, expressing the ordering power of the hand of the creator which eliminates chaos.⁹⁰

14 Given the ‘Jewish’ context, the phrase seems to allude to the *krater* of wine that Wisdom offers to mankind in the Septuagint.⁹¹ Alternatively, it could have recalled the cornucopia, one of the attributes of Sarapis, and thus have been interpreted as an allusion to Sarapis as provider of fruits in his identification with Pluto-Hades or the Roman Dis Pater, the ‘father of riches’.⁹²

15 αἰῶνα: It was with the *Timaeus* of Plato that the world αἰών – originally ‘life force’, ‘lifetime’ – became definitely ‘conceptualized’ to express the idea of ‘eternity’, and it is only with the Hellenistic period that from a philosophical concept it becomes a personal deity.⁹³ Aion plays a very important role in Hellenistic magic and is normally represented with a beard, a lion’s head (which can also appear at his side), four wings, a sceptre and a key. He personifies an infinite period of time,⁹⁴ the cyclical eternity that dominates the mechanics of the universe, especially from a cosmological and planetary point of view (he can be represented with a snake curling around his

⁹⁰ Leclant, *LdÄ* ‘Gotteshand’; Kákosy 1999, 16, 45 (2–4), 73 (3–6); *LGG* VII.628–9 (*drt-nt*, ‘the hand of god’, *drt-nt-Tm*, ‘the hand of Atum’); Meeks 2006, III.8–IV.3, 192–7. Cf. Stadler 2009a, 146–7; Zandee 1992, 171.

⁹¹ LXX, *Pr.* 9.1–6; cf. Philo, *De somn.* 2.248.2; Didym. Caec. *Comm. in Ecc.* 5–6.164.7–10. Similar echo in *Corp.Herm.* 4, *Πρὸς Τὰτ ὁ κρατήρ*: the creator god did not give intellect, νοῦς, to everyone, but sent it to the world in a *krater*.

⁹² Stambaugh 1972, 18–21, 27–35; cf. e.g. Plu. *De Iside* 362a; Clem. Al. *Protr.* 4.48.2.

⁹³ Plato, *Ti.* 37d–38c; cf. Aristot. *Cael.* 279a.22–8; Degani 1961, especially 77–93.

⁹⁴ For Aion as a personification of time, but not with this late iconography, e.g. Heraclit. fr. 52 (Diels and Kranz); Pind. *Isth.* 8.14–15; Eur. *Heracl.* 900.

body in seven coils symbolizing the seven planets).⁹⁵ His symbol is the snake with its tail in its mouth, the Egyptian ouroboros snake, which, apart from representing the recurrence of time, can also be understood as a metaphorical image of the universe.⁹⁶ His standard iconography seems to be of Assyro-Babylonian origin, but resembles the depictions both of Time, Χρόνος, in the hieronymian and rhapsodic Orphic theogonies,⁹⁷ and of the Egyptian Bes-Pantheos.⁹⁸ Aion can be identified with Sarapis, Osiris, Adonis, Agathos Daimon and solar deities,⁹⁹ among them Apollo Paian.¹⁰⁰

However, our phrase does not use αἰών as a divine name, but as a noun in its meaning of ‘eternity’, as shown by the genitive ‘Aion of everything’. Therefore, the god is not only ‘eternal’, but he ‘is’ eternity. Now, the word is a favourite of Judaeo-Christian literature where, in order to define an ‘eternal period of time’, it is almost always used in combinations such as εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ‘forever and ever’. God can rule (βασιλεύω) for eternity, be the king of eternity, and can be called Θεὸς αἰώνιος, ‘eternal God’, as in our hymn, though not directly αἰών.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, in various Gnostic systems an αἰών, Aeon, is one of the first emanations of God constituting the higher region of the sky above the celestial

⁹⁵ On the number seven in Egyptian magic, Dawson 1928; Goyon 1987; cf. Jasnow and Zauzich 2005, 213.

⁹⁶ Nock 1934, 78–99; on the ouroboros, Kákosy 1995b.

⁹⁷ A winged serpent, in one case with lion, bull and human head, appearing at the beginning of time; e.g. Guthrie 1993, 78–83; Ricciardelli 2000, xvi–xviii; West 1983, 68–104, 176–226; Brisson 1995, 42–51.

⁹⁸ Puech 1930, 421; Jackson 1985, 26–8; see **Intro**. p. 48.

⁹⁹ Sasse, *RAC* ‘Aion’; Le Glay, *LIMC* ‘Aion’; Levi 1944, especially 274–8, and on the representations of Aion in human shape; Kákosy 1964; Zuntz 1988, on Aion ‘Plutonium’-Sarapis as Underworld deity ‘bringer of rich crops’ (cf. line 14); Stambaugh 1972, 84–5.

¹⁰⁰ E.g. Mesom. *GDRK* fr. 4.17–20; Nock 1934, 97–8. Cf. Merkelbach and Stauber 1996, no. 26.2; cf. **Intro**. pp. 33–4.

¹⁰¹ E.g. LXX, *Ge.* 21.33.2, *Ex.* 15.18.1, *Is.* 26.4.1, *Ps.* 9.37.1, *Od.* 1.18.1; NT, *Ep.Rom.* 16.26.3, *Apoc.* 11.15.5; Clem. Rom. 1 *Cor.* 61.2.2.

spheres (see 4.1, 3), and God himself can be called αἰὼν τέλει-ος, ‘the perfect Aeon’.¹⁰²

However, the *OH* also define a god as ‘eternal’,¹⁰³ and the Egyptian supreme deities in particular can be described in the same terms. In Egyptian thought there is not just one eternity, but a ‘linear’ eternity, *dt*, and a cyclical one, *nhh*. Supreme gods can be identified with both eternities, and thus receive epithets such as *nhh* or *dt*, ‘*nhh*/*dt* eternity’. Furthermore, they rule over the eternities as expressed by the epithets *nb/nsww-nhh*, *nb/nsww-dt*, or *nb-nhh-dt*, ‘lord/king of the *nhh*/*dt* eternity(ies)’ – not surprisingly they are all epithets of Amun. We can find also epithets such as *wn.ty.fy-n-dt*, ‘who will exist forever’, not very different from our θεὸς αἰώνιος.¹⁰⁴

16 Given the structure of the phrase, it does not seem that two separate entities are invoked, but that ‘self-growing nature’ is used in apposition to ‘mightiest Adonaios’. Thus, the deity is said to be the ‘self-growing’ Nature (or ‘self-engendered’),¹⁰⁵ which corresponds to the cosmic conception of the god previously expressed by the hymn: the god ‘is’ Nature, which in its turn is described as self-growing due to its identification with the deity (see lines 11 and 32, αὐτογένεθλε).

ἄδωναῖον: Adjective derived from Ἀδωνάι (see line 9).¹⁰⁶

17 Another phrase stressing the solar nature of the god.

ἑλωαῖον: Adjective derived from the Hebrew *Elohai*, ‘my God’.¹⁰⁷

18–19 Non-metrical passage referring to the magical ritual. In Judaeo-Christian literature the word πνεῦμα can be used for

¹⁰² E.g. Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1.1.1.2. Sasse, *RAC* ‘Aion’ 200–2.

¹⁰³ *OH* 66.3.

¹⁰⁴ *LGG* IV.287–8 (*nhh*), VII.582–3 (*dt*), III.667–9 (*nb-nhh*), IV.330–1 (*nsww-nhh*), III.791–2 (*nb-dt*), IV.344–5 (*nsww-dt*), III.669–70 (*nb-nhh-dt*), II.380 (*wn.ty.fy-n-dt*); Assmann, *LdA* ‘Ewigkeit’; Assmann 2001a, 73–80. Cf. Hornung 1996, 182–4.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. αὐτοφυής in *OH* 8.3 (Helios), 12.9 (Heracles); cf. also the oracles of Apollo Clarius in Merkelbach and Stauber 1996, nos. 25.1, 26.14, 27.1; cf.

Intro. p. 34.

¹⁰⁶ See line 5, Ἰάω, I n.28.

¹⁰⁷ See line 5, Ἰάω, I n.28.

the ‘spirit of God’ or for an ‘angel’, but here, despite the Jewish context, τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα is an equivalent of ‘daimon’, referring to the spirit of a dead man (see lines 22, 24).¹⁰⁸

κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν: The phrase is Homeric.¹⁰⁹

20 κλῦθι, μάκαρ: As noted by Riesenfeld,¹¹⁰ the imperative κλῦθι is typical of Classical Greek poetry whether used to start a prayer to gods or to address human beings.¹¹¹ The same can be said about μάκαρ, which does not seem to add any special nuance since it can be an epithet of many deities (in the plural meaning ‘gods’, ‘the blessed ones’).¹¹² The combination κλῦθι, μάκαρ is attested only in the *PGM*¹¹³ and the *OH*.¹¹⁴

κλήζω σε: This specific combination is attested only in the *PGM* and the *OH*.¹¹⁵ Exactly the same apostrophe κλῦθι, μάκαρ, κλήζω σε is found in the *OH* to Hephaestus (66.10).

20–1 τὸν οὐρανοῦ ἡγεμονῆα καὶ γαίης, χάεός τε καὶ Ἄϊδος: It is difficult to find parallels for such a phrase in earlier Greek literature since the traditional regions of the cosmos included also ‘the sea’, missing here, and these regions were usually apportioned to different deities.¹¹⁶ The most interesting comparisons come again from Orphic literature: the above-mentioned hymn to Zeus (see line 11) and another hexametrical passage addressed to the ‘absolute ruler (τύραννε) of the sky

¹⁰⁸ LSJ, IV–V. Cf. 4.1, 3. For daimons in the *PGM*, Hopfner 1974–, I.1–126.

¹⁰⁹ Hom. *Il.* and *Od.* *passim*; *HH* 3.70.

¹¹⁰ Riesenfeld 1946; see **Intro.** p. 30.

¹¹¹ E.g. Hom. *passim*; Theogn. *Eleg.* 1.4, 13; Aesch. *Ch.* 139, 332; Eur. *Hipp.* 872; Apoll. Rhod. 1.411, 4.783; till Procl. *Hym.* 1.1–2.

¹¹² E.g. *HH* 8.16, 22.7; Pind. *Nem.* 7.94; Eur. *Ion* 457, *IA* 1483; Maiistas, 64; Mesom. *GDRK* fr. 3.14; *OH*, *passim*. Check e.g. the many instances in Furley and Bremer 2001, index. Found also in the fragmentary hymn to Apollo in III 234 (cf. **Intro.** p. 54).

¹¹³ IV 443, 1958 (2.7); II 85 (7.8).

¹¹⁴ E.g. *OH* 8.1, 30.8, 34.27, 39.9, cf. e.g. 2.13, 3.3; Kruse, *RE* ‘Makar’; cf. Morand 2001, 48–50.

¹¹⁵ *OH* 61.1. See e.g. III 237 in the fragmentary hymn to Apollo (cf. **Intro.** p. 54).

¹¹⁶ For ‘heaven, earth and sea’ used for ‘the whole world’, e.g. *HH* 2.33–5.

(αἰθέρος), Hades, sea and earth'.¹¹⁷ In the first case, the extended hegemony of Zeus has to be connected with the cosmic conception of the deity expressed by the hymn: his leadership over the various regions is implied in his 'being' the various regions. The second case lists the traditional regions of the cosmos and seems to imply again the myth of the swallowing of Phanes/Protogonus (see line 11) even if the cosmic nature of the god is not mentioned. What seems hard to conceive in Greek religious thought is that a deity exerting a power over the sky and the earth is at the same time a chthonic Underworld god. However, this impasse was overcome by Sarapis, who as Zeus-Helios-Sarapis encompassed both the solar Upperworld and the chthonic Underworld nature.¹¹⁸ It would not be too hazardous to think that this fusion of competences was favoured by the Egyptian religion, in which the solar god had not only always been imagined as travelling every night through the Netherworld, but – especially from the New Kingdom onwards – during his night journey was identified with Osiris, the god of the dead.¹¹⁹ Thus, in Egyptian literature the solar deity/Osiris is frequently addressed as lord of the different regions of the cosmos including the Netherworld: *nb-pt-t3-dw3t*, 'lord of the sky, earth and Duat' (Netherworld), or 'king in the sky, ruler in the Duat, sovereign in the two river banks (i.e. Egypt, i.e. earth)'.¹²⁰

Coming back to our hymn, the real oddity in this verse is the mention of 'chaos', which seems to be used instead of the

¹¹⁷ Cf. **I** n.67; Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 691: but possibly a syncretistic hymn influenced by Judaism, West 1983, 35–6.

¹¹⁸ Hani 1970; Stambaugh 1972, 79–84 (79, for a list of attestations of the formula 'Zeus Helios Great Sarapis'); cf. **Intro**, pp. 8–9.

¹¹⁹ Hornung 1991; Wiebach-Koepke 2007, especially 9–33; Piankoff 1964, 10–21; already in *BoD* 17; Griffiths, *LdA* 'Osiris' VII. Niwinsky 1987–8; Spalinger 2008; though cf. Quack 2012a, especially 180–1. Cf. also Seeber 1976, especially 120–3; Rambova 1957.

¹²⁰ *LGG* III.626–7 (*nb-pt-t3*), 627–8 for similar epithets including *nb-pt-t3-dw3t*; Opet I, 62 (Bedier 1995, no. 30); Mendel 2003, 138–40, §34.

missing ‘sea’ and is rarely conceived as a region of the cosmos. Of course this could be the case and ‘chaos’ could be translated ‘nether abyss’, ‘infinite darkness’, as when used together with Erebus to identify a region of the Underworld.¹²¹ Similarly, ‘chaos’ and ‘Hades’ could be a hendiadys: the former would be used just to describe the obscurity or vastness of the latter. In both cases, there would be only three regions mentioned: sky, earth and Hades, but no sea, as in the Egyptian examples mentioned above. On the other hand, in the Egyptian list of ‘regions’ we can find also *Nwn*, Nun, the primeval ocean, the body of water representing the indistinctness of the time before creation.¹²² This suggests that the chaos of our phrase could be the Greek primordial Chaos, the equivalent of Nun, possibly replacing the sea in the standard list of regions under the influence of the Egyptian parallel expression.¹²³

21 ἔνθα νέμονται ... : see 2.8–9.

22–8 MT maintain that the daimon is not supposed to appear in the flesh but as a vision during a dream.¹²⁴ Now, of the four attestations of this hymn, only one is without doubt a dream oracle: VIII 74–81 (2C), entitled ‘dream oracle of the god Bes’. This instance, as well as the passage in 22–8, suggested that this metrical section was ‘originally’ used, or created, for dream

¹²¹ LSJ, 3–4; e.g. Plato, *Spuria* 371e.5; Plu. *De primo* 953a.3; West 1966, *ad* Hes. *Th.* 116; ‘chaos’ is clearly perceived as a region of the Underworld in IV 1350 and VII 350, where the magician invokes the daimons, ‘inhabitants of chaos, of Erebus, of the abyss, of the depth, of the earth’; cf. IV 1459–62, 2534–6 (12.11–12) where it appears among other typical spots of the Underworld landscape.

¹²² E.g. LGG III.627–8: *nb-pt-t3-dw3t-(t3w)-mw-Nwn-h3swt*, ‘lord of the sky, the earth, the Netherworld, (the wind), the water, the Nun and the foreign lands’.

¹²³ Cf. Zeno of Citium fr. 103, 104 (von Arnim), who interprets the Hesiodic Chaos – the first principle/god who came into being – as water, giving an etymology from χέω, ‘to pour’.

¹²⁴ On dream oracles in the *PGM*, Hopfner 1974–90, II.1.259–334.

oracles.¹²⁵ Whether true or not, it could be used also in other contexts: the spell in question, for example, does not involve sleeping, since the magician, in order to dismiss the daimon, not only has to recite some verses but also to perform a specific action with the objects he is holding. The spirit, as happens in other spells, could appear in the flame of the lamp or as a spectre;¹²⁶ in any case, it is perceived as dangerous since the ritual includes a protective charm and during the invocation the solar god is solicited to send the daimon ‘gentle, benevolent, not thinking anything against me’. Furthermore, in three of the four versions of the hymn (1, 2A and 2B) there is a detail that is not consistent with the dream oracle explanation: the performer is trying to reawaken the spirit of a specific dead person, the one whose remains are in his possession (see line 24), and the use of this kind of *ousia* (magical material) is usually not necessary in dream oracles. Perhaps it is not fortuitous that the reference to the corpse’s remains does not appear in the only version of the hymn that was certainly used within a dream oracle (2C).

ἐμαῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπαιδαῖς: Also at 27. The use of the adjective ἱερός seems to stress the religious nature of the incantations.¹²⁷

23 The mention of the night does not necessarily imply a dream oracle since in Greek tradition all necromancy rituals had to be performed after sunset.¹²⁸ The reason for this requirement was that they involved the appeal to chthonic deities, while here a solar god is invoked for a necromantic

¹²⁵ Cf. also Perdrizet and Lefebvre 1978, xx–xxi, who hypothesize that VIII 64–110 describes the procedures that had to be performed by those who were about to consult the oracle of Bes in the Memnonium of Abydos (which was active between the first/second and fifth centuries). Similarly, Frankfurter 2005, 241–2.

¹²⁶ Cf. I 284, 332–3; Brashear 1995, 3495–503.

¹²⁷ On this pattern, Furley 2007, 79; for its use in Greek hexametrical incantations see Faraone 2011a, 196–8. On the connection between the chanted song and *goēleia*, see Johnston 1999, 111–18.

¹²⁸ Headlam 1902, especially 52–3; Ogden 2001, 166–8; a possible exception in Aesch. *Pers.* 607–93, Lawson 1934, 82–3.

purpose. Moreover, saying that the daimon is subdued by the god's constraint at night implies the idea that the solar god can especially exert power over the spirit of the dead at night. All this seems to allude again to the Egyptian idea of the sun travelling through the Netherworld at night.

24 The magician possesses some kind of magical material (possibly hair or a piece of cloth) belonging to the corpse of the spirit he wants Apollo to send to him.¹²⁹ The reference to the corpse is clearer in **2A** and **2B** since the former is introduced by the prescription of saying the verses 'while holding the magical material from the tomb' (IV 435), and the latter by the invocation 'grant me power over the spirit of this man who died a violent death, from whose corpse I hold this' (IV 1949–52). The use of a magical *ousia* has some famous Greek literary precedents¹³⁰ as a means for targeting the victim in erotic magic.¹³¹

28 Preisendanz corrects the papyrus reading ἄρκιον with ἄρτιον, following the parallel in IV 1976 (**2B.18**), since, I suppose, he thinks that the adjective ἄρκιος ('sure', 'sufficient', 'useful', 'able to') does not make sense. On the other hand, MT keep the reading, but translate it 'heil', 'safe and sound', a meaning that better suits ἄρτιος ('complete', 'perfect', 'ready') than ἄρκιος. With the phrase 'mind the whole body reaches the light complete', the performer would ask not to be harmed while going through a period of 'darkness', i.e. during the night

¹²⁹ MT, I.10–11. For this necromantic ritual see Faraone 2004, especially 228–30; again on this and on necromancy in the *PGM* see Faraone 2005, especially 258–64. See also Johnston 2008, 97–8, 171–3; in ancient Greece, Morrison 1981, 89–90.

¹³⁰ E.g. Theocr. 2.53–4; Eur. *Hipp.* 513–15; Luc. *DMeretr.* 4.13–15.

¹³¹ In the *PGM* it is not always clear whether the 'magical material' refers to various ingredients previously mentioned or to a piece of something belonging to a specific person. Here are some unambiguous examples: IV 350, 2089, XV, 11, XXXVI 73. Cf. also the cases in which hair was found folded or rolled up inside applied spells (XVI and XIXa, both love spells) or *defixiones*: Jordan 1985b, 251–2. For *ousia* in Egyptian magic e.g. Ritner 1993, 225, nos. 1043–4, 210 no. 971.

or sleep.¹³² This interpretation makes sense only if we imagine the hymn as part of a dream oracle (see lines 22–8) or of a ritual performed at night (but night is not mentioned in the prose spell). Moreover, from a linguistic point of view, the absence of a personal pronoun referring to the magician’s body is quite odd within what would be a personal protection request. The hymn in VIII 74–81 (2C) – the only version appearing inside a dream oracle – could strengthen this interpretation, but, curiously enough, in this attestation the line in question is missing.

Looking at the Greek and the general sense of the passage, the phrase seems not to refer to the magician, but to the spirit that has to appear: the solar god should ‘send him gentle . . .’, not ‘be indignant’ at the request of the magician, but take care of the condition of the body (note that δέμας can be used also for ‘corpse’).¹³³ The parallel in 2.18–20B is even clearer: after the same passage follows the phrase ‘and may he, NN, reveal to me the “who” and “whence”, by which now he can do me this service, and when he is my assistant’. The object of the discussion is always the daimon evoked.¹³⁴ Of course, it is not immediately clear why the body of a dead person should ‘come to light complete, ready, useful or able to’. But in Egyptian tradition, the integrity of the bodily frame (δέμας) was the main requirement for the dead to be able to continue to live in the afterlife. Many funerary texts and rites are devoted to the preservation of the body.¹³⁵ ‘The ones who came out complete (*kn*) from the Land of the west (the Netherworld)’¹³⁶ are the dead who, having accomplished all the necessary rites, have regained the use of their physical faculties and have become what we call ‘transfigured dead’ and the Egyptians called *ꜥḥw*, ‘the effective ones’, as they were able to live a new eternal life.

¹³² This is what MT’s translation, ‘schütze mich, dass mein Leib morgen wieder heil ans Licht komme’, suggests.

¹³³ LSJ; here the meaning could be something like ‘silhouette’.

¹³⁴ Similarly Calvo Martínez 2006, 173.

¹³⁵ Cf. Assmann 2001b, 143–59; Smith 2009, 1–16.

¹³⁶ Koenig 1981, recto X, 7.

Not having undergone the ‘second death’, they were also the only ones able to come and go from the world of the living and to communicate with it.¹³⁷ Now, the adjective ἄρκιος also means ‘useful’ in doing something and ‘able to’ do something, and thus ‘effective in doing something’.¹³⁸ In conclusion, as the daimon has to communicate with the magician and to speak with him, in the Egyptian conception he certainly needs to be ‘complete’, ‘effective’. Thus, using ἄρκιος or ἄρτιος would not make a great difference: the magician asks the solar god to grant that the bodily frame of the dead person he is invoking (also thanks to the remains in his possession, see line 24) may be ‘effective’, so that he can interact with him normally.

Finding an idea like this in the *PGM* should not be surprising, considering how Pharaonic funerary customs survived throughout the Graeco-Roman period.¹³⁹ At the same time, even if expressed in different terms, a similar idea is also found in Greek tradition starting from Homer: the blood of the sacrificed animals in Odysseus’ necromancy ritual seems to be needed to restore the ghosts’ corporality and thus make them capable of communicating with the performer.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁷ *Wb* I.13–14; Otto, *LdÄ* ‘Ach’; Taylor 2001, in particular 15–16, 27, 31–2; Loprieno 2003, 211–16; Goelet in Von Dassow, Wasserman, Faulkner and Goelet 1994, 150–4. Arriving in the Netherworld the heart of the dead person is put on a scale by the god Thoth and counterweighed by the plume symbol of Maat (the personified concept of order, truth, justice, morality, cosmic equilibrium): the heart must not weigh more than Maat, otherwise the dead person will not be allowed to live his eternal life but will undergo the ‘second death’, i.e. total cancellation from existence. At the same time the deceased has to go through the so-called negative confession: in front of the court of the gods he lists all the evil deeds he ‘did not’ commit in life. Once the deceased is acquitted, as the evaluation process is based on an act of speech, he is declared *mꜣ’ hꜣw*, ‘true (right, without fault) of voice’, i.e. ‘justified’. See also Seeber 1976, especially 63–113, 139–54.

¹³⁸ Cf. LSJ, II: e.g. Nicand. *Th.* 837, ἄρκια νούσων, meaning ‘remedies (‘useful things’, ‘capable things’, ‘effective things’) against diseases.

¹³⁹ Smith 2009, 16–49; see II n.84 and n.85.

¹⁴⁰ Hom. *Od.* 11.147–9; Ogden 2001, 173–4; Johnston 1999, 7–8; cf. Steiner 1971 for Anatolian parallels, especially 270–5.

The whole interpretation can be corroborated by the presence of ἐς φῶς ἐλθεῖν. In Greek poetry, expressions such as ‘to see the light’ or ‘to come to the light’ are often metaphorically used for ‘to be alive’, ‘to come (back) to life’ and at the same time the word φῶς can also mean ‘light of a lamp’.¹⁴¹ Of course, as Hypnus was the brother of Thanatus and sleep was compared to a ‘small’ death, we could imagine the magician asking that his body may ‘come back to life intact’ after a dream oracle. However, given the entire context discussed above, it seems more likely he is asking for the body frame of the dead to come back to life ‘effective’ (possibly, in the flame of the lamp).

29 From the longer parallel in 2.18–19A the phrase would seem to mean that the god taught men the art of prophecy.

30–1 A quite obscure phrase which seems to mean that, following the principle of the isopsephia already seen for the name Abrasax, the numeric value of the letters forming the name of the god is equivalent to the Moirai, i.e. to the numeric value of the word ‘Moirai’ – or of ‘Clotho’, ‘Lachesis’, ‘Atropos’ – or to the number three.¹⁴² Unfortunately, the magical palindrome αχᾱῖφωθωθᾱῖηᾱῖα ᾱῖηᾱῖηᾱθωθωφιαχα does not fit any of the possible numeric values. However, as it is formed by thirty-six letters, it could mean that the divine name has thirty-six letters as thirty-six are the Moirai, where Moirai would be used instead of ‘decans’.¹⁴³ On the other hand, the phrase could signify that the name is equal to three in the sense that it is tripartite, which would correspond to the initial, αχᾱῖφωθωθω, middle, ᾱῖηᾱῖα ᾱῖηᾱῖα, and final, ωθωθωφιαχα, part of the palindrome, or to the initial, αχᾱῖφω, middle, θωθω, and final, ᾱῖηᾱῖα, part of the sequence then repeated palindromically. All this would be an allusion to the solar nature of the god in its

¹⁴¹ LSJ, 2; e.g. Hom. *Il.* 18.61; Soph. *OT* 375, *Ph.* 625; Aesch. *Pers.* 630; Plato, *Prt.* 320d4. See 2.8–9 where the spirits of the dead are the ones ‘who once saw the light (φῶς)’.

¹⁴² On isopsephia, Dornseiff 1988, especially 96–106. Cf. Calvo Martínez 2006, 174–5.

¹⁴³ Dornseiff 1988, 61, 83. Cf. Fauth 1995, 35–6.

three cyclically repeating manifestations – dawn, midday and sunset – which would correspond both to the symbolism of the palindrome itself (imagined as an alphabetical representation of the cyclical eternity equivalent to the ouroboros snake biting its tail) and to the symbolism of the Moirai embodying the three stages of birth, life and death – and at the same time the three divisions of time, Past, Present and Future.¹⁴⁴ In conclusion, the phrase could state that the magician knows the name of the deity, i.e. his nature, and that this nature is tripartite: the perpetually renewing nature of the sun. Within the palindrome, at least one phonetic transliteration from the Egyptian can be recognized: $\theta\omega\theta$, ‘Thoth’, which, together with the following ω , $\theta\omega\theta\omega$, might mean ‘Thoth the great’ (*Dhwtj-ʿ*).¹⁴⁵

32–7 Here is the release, or apopemptic hymn, which no doubt addresses the supreme deity even if, in theory, it should be directed to the spirit of the dead that the magician evoked. Some confusion could have arisen from the re-elaboration of different sources; however, the prerequisite for a sensible interpretation is always to consider that the text must have made sense for whoever wrote it or read it. Thus, we must conclude that, as the solar god is the one controlling the daimon, his ‘presence’ is implied during the magical procedure: in order to release the envoy, the magician has to release the sender. As Ritner maintained, these verses ‘are Egyptian in character and refer to the sun god’s self-generation and daily travel in his ship’.¹⁴⁶

32 Ἰλαθί μοι: A common imperative in Greek poetry.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ De Angeli, *LLMC* ‘Moirai’. On the palindrome as a cyclic symbol, Preisendanz, *RE* ‘Palindrom’; Dornseiff 1988, 63; Szepes 1976, 216. Cf. the end of the *Homeric Hymn* to Hermes (550–65) where the god receives from Apollo a share in divination: a bee-oracle which consists of three sisters that a branch of the tradition calls $\mu\omicron\iota\rho\alpha\iota$; they dwell on a ridge of Parnassus and, with their heads covered in barley, prophesy thanks to the consumption of honey (see Vergados 2013, *ad loc.*).

¹⁴⁵ Ritner in Betz 1992, 11, no. 60; BG.

¹⁴⁶ Betz 1992, 12, no. 61.

¹⁴⁷ E.g. Hom. *Od.* 3.380; Callim. *Hym.* 6.138; Apoll. Rhod. 4.1014, 1600; *AP* 5.86.1, 15.29.6; Procl. *Hym.* 7.40.

προπάτωρ: The use of this noun meaning ‘forefather’, ‘ancestor’ is attested in Greek literature from Pindar onwards.¹⁴⁸ As it happened with **πατήρ**, it was probably its use in Judaeo-Christian literature that reinforced the ‘creative’ nuance,¹⁴⁹ so that from ‘ancestor’ it came to mean ‘first creator’ in the *PGM*.¹⁵⁰ In any case, outside this corpus its use as a divine epithet remains very limited.¹⁵¹ This could suggest that **προπάτωρ** here represents a Greek rendering of the Egyptian expression ‘father of fathers’, especially owing to its proximity to **προγενέστερε** and **αὐτογένεθλε** (hereinafter). The title of *it-ītw*, ‘father of fathers’, though normally attributed to Amun, can be found in relation to every god who participates in the creative process according to different cosmogonies, for example Ptah.¹⁵² In fact, it represents just one of the numerous ways in which Egyptian poetry expresses the idea of the pre-existence of the creator god.

Unlike Greek, Egyptian makes great use of similar genitival constructions, probably owing to the way in which the language expresses the superlative: the regular form of the adjective is used in a genitival construction of the kind *wr (n) wrw*, ‘the great one of the great ones’ = ‘the greatest’; alternatively, to intensify the quality expressed by the adjective, the regular form can be repeated twice or thrice (*wr wr*, or *wr sp 2*, ‘twice great’, ‘very great’, *wr wr wr*, ‘thrice great’, ‘greatest’). Therefore, the epithets

¹⁴⁸ E.g. Pind. *Nem.* 4.89; Eur. *Or.* 1441; Hdt. 2.161.4, 169.19; Plato, *Lg.* 717e1; Diod. Sic. 13.59.5.2.

¹⁴⁹ E.g. LXX, 3 *Ma.* 2.21.1; Philo, *De op.* 145.5; cf. Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1, *passim*, on Propator in Valentinian Gnosis.

¹⁵⁰ I 200, III 443, IV 948, 3119, XII 237. Also *Corp.Herm.* fr. 2a.13.3, 2b.3.7, 23.10.5; Iambl. *Myst.* 8.4.22. For **προπάτωρ** in the specific meaning of ‘indirect cause higher than the direct cause of the entity of which it is the forefather’ allegedly deriving from Plato, *Ti.* 41a–e, see Van den Berg 2001, 264.

¹⁵¹ E.g. Luc. *Peregr.* 28.7; Theophil. *Ad Autol.* 1.10.11; Chariton, 6.1.10.4; *AP* 7.430.9; Procl. *Hym.* 6.3. Cf. Ariphron’s Paian to Hygieia in Furley and Bremer 2001, 6.3.1 (especially II, 176–7), for the similar **πρεσβίστα** used as divine epithet in the sense of ‘most venerable’, and not ‘oldest’.

¹⁵² *LGG* I.575–6, Funktionen A.e for Ptah, but also e.g. A.i for Khnum. E.g. P. Berlin 3048, III.3; cf. *PDM* xiv 220 [VIII 2]. A summary of the main Egyptian cosmogonies in Lesko 1991, 90–7.

such as *īt-ītw* seem also to convey a superlative shade such as ‘the fatherest’, i.e. ‘the father *par excellence*’.¹⁵³

προγενέστερε: Even in this case, the comparative of *προγενής* meaning ‘earlier in birth’, ‘elder’, is attested throughout Greek literature from Homer onwards, but its use as a pure divine epithet meaning ‘first born’, ‘primordial’, is very rare.¹⁵⁴ This brings us again to Egyptian hymnography, where the epithet *smṣw*, ‘elder one’, ‘eldest’,¹⁵⁵ is very often used for primordial-creator gods expressing the same idea as *προπάτωρ*, ‘father of fathers’. Thus, we find it attributed to all the gods who are thought to be creators: for example both Amun and Ptah can be the ‘eldest’¹⁵⁶ or ‘the eldest of the primordial gods’.¹⁵⁷

αὐτογένεθλε: This epithet is particularly interesting as it is a late formation in Greek (not attested before the second century),¹⁵⁸ and embodies a concept almost unknown to traditional Greek religious thought,¹⁵⁹ but very common in Egyptian in relation to creator gods: the god is self-begotten, being the primeval creator of the cosmos. The epithet most frequently found in hymnography and temple inscriptions is *hpr-ds.f*, literally ‘who came into being by himself’,¹⁶⁰ formed with the participle of the

¹⁵³ Allen 2000, 6.8, 9.5.

¹⁵⁴ E.g. XII, 67, 575; addressing Christ: *AP* 1.21.1; cf. e.g. the superlative *προγενέστατος* used for ‘the mind’ in Aristot. *De an.* 410b14; for Eros, Plu. *Amatorius* 756f3.

¹⁵⁵ *LGG* VI.347–9.

¹⁵⁶ See I n.155; e.g. Hibis, Klotz 2006, III.40; P. Berlin 3055, XIII.10, XVI.2.

¹⁵⁷ *LGG* VI.351–2 (*smṣw-pzwtḥw*); e.g. P. Berlin 3048, II.1–2.

¹⁵⁸ E.g. *Orac. Chald.* 39.1; it remains rare and mainly attested in Judaeo-Christian literature. The similar *αὐτογενής*, ‘self-produced’, appears already in Aesch. *Supp.* 8, though at this early stage it is used in the meaning of ‘kindred’ and not as divine epithet (LSJ II).

¹⁵⁹ The similar adjective *αὐτοφυής* (see line 16), apart from the meaning ‘natural’, ‘innate’, expresses more the idea of ‘self-growth’, ‘self-existence’, than of ‘self-generation’ (LSJ). Cf. *OH* 8.3 (Helios), 12.9 (Heracles), Ricciar-delli 2000, *ad loc.*

¹⁶⁰ *LGG* V.703–6; e.g. Leitz 1999, BM EA 10042, I.9, III.10; Aufrère 2000, 6b 149d; Stele BM 551, 18; Traunecker 1992, 68, 2.6; *BoD* 17. Cf. Zandee 1992, 175–6.

verb *hpr*, ‘come into being’, ‘be born’, and the reflexive *ds.f*. Examples are also to be found in magical literature. For instance, in the Brooklyn magical papyrus (see line 11 and **Intro**. pp. 49–50), Amun-Re is described as the one ‘who came into being by himself, the great eldest god of the primordial time’,¹⁶¹ a phrase which could include not only the equivalent of αὐτογένεθλος but also of προγενέστερος. In conclusion, the compound αὐτογένεθλος is likely to have been used to translate an Egyptian participial phrase. This confirms that compound words should not be regarded as ‘Greek’ in themselves, especially considering that the Egyptian language does not allow compounds such as αὐτογένεθλος but only ‘compound expressions’.¹⁶²

33 In the Greek tradition the idea of fire as the first creative principle of the universe had been especially developed by the Stoics, who identified it with the λόγος, ‘universal reason’/god, starting from Cleanthes drawing on Heraclitus’ views. Thus, translating ἄβυσσος with ‘great deep’, ‘infinite void’, we could hypothesize a philosophical echo in a phrase such as ‘the fire which first appeared in the abyss’. Unfortunately, the other attestations of ἄβυσσος in the *PGM* point to a different interpretation since ‘the abyss’ seems to be perceived either as the Netherworld (or a region of it),¹⁶³ or as a body of water.¹⁶⁴ Therefore, we should conclude that the fire mentioned by the hymn is imagined as appearing in the Underworld (or generally underground), or in the water, but neither of these possibilities fits with a Greek cosmogony, whether philosophical or

¹⁶¹ Sauneron 1970, 4.3. Also on magical healing statues, e.g. Kákosy 1999, 53 (III.1–2), 130 (X+14), 141 (VIII.2); P. Bremner-Rhind, XVIII.17, in Faulkner 1933 (translation: Faulkner 1937a).

¹⁶² Especially in the so-called *nfr-hr* construction: ‘beautiful of face’, i.e. ‘with a beautiful face’ (equivalent e.g. to εὐπρόσωπος); Allen 2000, 6.5. Cf. 2.22A αὐτολόχευτε.

¹⁶³ E.g. IV 1120, 1350, LXII 29–31.

¹⁶⁴ E.g. IV 512, VII 517, XIII 169, 482 (cf. also 15.34); also IV 3064, a passage echoing the Septuagint, Betz 1992, 97 notes *ad loc.*, especially LXX, *Jē*. 5.22. On ἄβυσσος hardly meaning ‘the void’ see also III 554 (4.5), IV 1148, VII 261, XXXV 1, XXXVI 217.

mythological. Of course, considering that $\pi\tilde{\upsilon}\rho$ can be metaphorically used for 'light' or 'heat',¹⁶⁵ we could interpret the phrase as an allusion to Genesis 1.2–5: 'the darkness was over the abyss ($\alpha\beta\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\varsigma$) and the spirit of God moved over the water. And God said: "let there be light", and there was light.'

At the same time, fire has an ambivalent symbolism within the Egyptian religious tradition: it is the perfect means for the annihilation of enemies, since destroying their bodies completely prevents them from living a second life in the Netherworld;¹⁶⁶ as it produces light, it finds an easy association with the light of the sun and its warming, life-giving force. These aspects make it one of the commonest attributes of solar deities: every night the sun god has to overthrow his enemies in the Netherworld in order to rise again the following morning. Fire as a means of annihilation plays a fundamental role in the daily fight and triumph of the sun; thus, as a symbol of regeneration, it is also the means through which the daily rebirth of the sun is achieved.¹⁶⁷ As far as its defensive–devastating power is concerned, the best example is the fire-spitting uraeus serpent placed on the forehead of solar deities and kings.

Coming back to our hymn, the phrase 'the fire which first appeared in the abyss' recalls an image typical of the Hermopolitan cosmogony which is to be found again in the theology of Amun and other solar gods: the primordial deity emerges as sunlight from the Nun, the primeval ocean, at the beginning of time.¹⁶⁸ Similarly, in our hymn the solar god seems to

¹⁶⁵ LSJ, 5b. See also Johnston 2004 on the theurgic identification among divinity, light and fire.

¹⁶⁶ See I n.135 and n.137.

¹⁶⁷ Hornung 1963; Hornung *LdÄ* 'Amduat', D; Hermesen 1995, 73–4, 84–6; Grieshammer, *LdÄ* 'Feuer'.

¹⁶⁸ On the connection between the fire/flame and the primordial mound in the Hermopolitan cosmogony see Hermesen 1995. E.g. P. Berlin 3049, VIII.3, 'you enlightened the obscured earth when you rose up from the Nun'; P. Berlin 3055, XVIII.9: 'he came out of the water, he wrapped himself up with the flame'. Cf. Zivie-Coche 2009.

‘be’ the first appearing fire, which would not fit with Genesis 1.2–3 where light is a creation of God. Bergman demonstrated that at least in one case (VII 517) ἄβυσσος is used in the *PGM* to translate Nun, and νοῦν, the Coptic word derived from *Nwn*, means ‘abyss’, ‘depth’, of hell, earth or sea.¹⁶⁹

34 The word δυνάμις is often used in Hellenistic hymns to refer specifically to the divine power.¹⁷⁰

35 Unless we are dealing with a separate entity, which is quite unlikely, the verse should again refer to the solar god, which would fit with line 21, where he was the ‘supreme ruler of Hades’. As discussed above, implying that the sun is the lord of the Netherworld seems to reflect a long-standing Egyptian conception, and the presence of this phrase within this very ‘Egyptian-echoing’ passage could confirm the analysis in line 21. Furthermore, the idea of the god ‘destroying in Hades’ adds an even more Egyptian nuance since the sun god, during his Netherworld journey, is traditionally engaged in the ‘destruction’ of his enemies, first of all the serpent Apophis, who every night tries to prevent the new dawn.¹⁷¹

36–7 The passage implies that the solar god is imagined as travelling by boat, as he does in the Egyptian mythology, and not by chariot, as he does in the Greek.¹⁷² Though the final request would better suit the daimon than the solar god himself (cf. lines 32–7), pleading with the god for benevolence does not contrast with the rest of the hymn, since he had already been asked to come propitiously (line 8) and not to be indignant (line 27).

¹⁶⁹ Within a possible Egyptian theogony, Bergman 1982, 34; Thissen 1991, 297; cf. XXXVI 217; Crum et al. 1939, 226; Fauth 1995, 82.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.11, σὴ δυνάμει Νείλου ποταμοὶ πληροῦνται ἅπαντες, ‘through your power all the channels of the Nile are filled’, and Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.* Cf. also an earlier attestation in Aristotle’s hymn to Virtue (*PMG* 842): Furley and Bremer 2001, 7.4.11; cf. also Jördens 2013, 143–50.

¹⁷¹ Cf. I n.119, n.167 and n.358.

¹⁷² Kitchen, *LdÄ* ‘Barke’. Cf. 7.14, 20–6; Plu. *De Iside* 364c8–9.

HYMN 2

VERSIONS TWO, THREE AND FOUR TO HELIOS-HORUS: IV 436–61 [A], 1957–89 [B] (FOURTH CENTURY) AND VIII 74–81 (FOURTH/FIFTH CENTURY) [C]

These three versions of the hymn are very similar and thus are analysed together. In fact, although there are some variants and differences in the disposition of the verses (see apparatus), they are not significant as far as the contents required to investigate the nature of divinity are concerned. The three versions appear in three different spells: version two [A] in a love spell; version three [B] in a necromantic procedure aimed at acquiring a spirit as assistant; and version four [C] in a dream oracle. Here is an outline of the spells' structure.

Spell of version A (IV 296–466)

- Title: Φιλτροκατάδεσμος θαυμαστός, 'extraordinary binding-love spell'.
- Preliminaries and rite: The magician prepares two wax figurines, a man and a woman;¹⁷³ the latter has to be engraved with magical words and pierced with copper needles. A spell is recited and written on a lead tablet to be placed with the figurines beside the grave of someone who had an untimely or violent death.
- Spell for the lead tablet: The magician addresses chthonic gods and daimons, so that they may assist one daimon (also called 'god of the dead') who has to attract and bind the

¹⁷³ Cf. DD, 239–44, nos. 330–5.

victim of the spell so that she will be ‘filled with love and desire’ for the performer of the spell (or for his client).

- Invocation: The **hymn** invokes Helios-Horus so that he sends a daimon to attract the victim of the spell. Contrary to version one, in this case the allusion to the necromantic procedure fits the context since the spell makes clear that the ‘daimon’ is chthonic and identifies him with the spirit of a dead person (not by chance the lead tablet has to be placed beside the grave of someone who had an untimely or violent death).

Spell of version B (IV 1928–2005)

- Title: ‘Spell of attraction of King Pitys over any skull cup’.¹⁷⁴
- Prayer to Helios: The magician briefly invokes Helios so that the god may grant him power over the spirit of one who died violently.
- Invocation: The **hymn** has to be recited at sunset. Also in this case, the allusion to necromantic procedures fits the context. Moreover, the final part of the hymn was slightly modified to refer specifically to the spirit of the deceased, who is supposed to become the magician’s assistant.
- Rite: The magician has to write magical words on thirteen ivy leaves, to be used as a wreath, and on a skull.

Spell of version C (VIII 64–110)

- Title: ‘Dream oracle of the god Bes’.
- Preliminaries: Before going to sleep, the magician has to copy on his left hand the image of Bes (drawn at the end of the spell) and wrap his hand and his neck with a ‘black cloth of Isis’.
- Invocation: The **hymn** (of which only eight verses are preserved, lines 1–6, 11–12) invokes Helios so that he may send a daimon, a ‘truthful prophet’, to prophesy to the magician.

¹⁷⁴ For the word σκύφος, ‘cup’, referring to a skull in this spell and in other passages of the *PGM* see Faraone 2005, especially 262–9.

- Alternative procedure: If the magician wants to conjure the daimon with a lamp divination instead of a dream oracle, he has to use a lamp and a different prayer (a non-metrical invocation to the ‘headless god’).¹⁷⁵
- Notes and release: This final section describes the drawing of the god Bes and the release procedure (the magician dismisses the daimon by wiping out the sketch of Bes drawn on his hand).
- Drawing of the god Bes.

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: MT.¹⁷⁶

- Ἀεροφοιτήτων ἀνέμων ἐποχούμενος αὔραις,
 Ἥλιε χρυσοκόμα, διέπων φλογὸς ἀκάματον πῦρ,
 αἰθερίοισι τρίβοισι μέγαν πόλον ἀμφιελίσσων,
 γεννῶν αὐτὸς ἅπαντα, ἅπερ πάλιν ἐξαναλύεις·
 5 ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ στοιχεῖα τεταγμένα σοῖσι νόμοισι,
 κόσμον ἅπαντα τρέφουσι τετρά(τρο)πον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν.
 κλυθι, μάκαρ· κλήζω σε, τὸν οὐρανοῦ ἡγεμονῆα,
 γαίης τε χάεός τε καὶ Ἄϊδος, ἔνθα νέμονται
 δαίμονες ἀνθρώπων, οἱ πρὶν φάος εἰσορόωντες.
 10 καὶ δὴ νῦν λίτομαί σε, μάκαρ, ἄφθιτε, δέσποτα κόσμου·
 ἦν γαίης κευθμῶνα μόλης νεκύων τ' ἐνὶ χώρῳ,
 πέμψον δαίμονα τοῦτον ἐμοὶ μεσάταισι ἐν ὥραις
 νυκτός, ἐλευσόμενον προστάγμασι σῆς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης,
 οὐ̐περ ἀπὸ σκῆνους κατέχω τόδε λείψανον ἐν χερσὶν ἐμαῖς,
 15 ἵν', ὅσα θέλω ἐν φρεσὶ ἐμαῖς, πάντα μοι ἐκτελέσῃ,
 πραῦς, μειλίχιος μηδ' ἀντία μοι φρονέοιτο.
 μηδὲ σὺ μηνίσῃς ἐπ' ἐμαῖς ἱεραῖσιν ἐπωδαῖς·
 A ταῦτα γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔταξας ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δαῖναι
 νήματα Μοιράων καὶ σαῖς ὑποθημοσύνησι.
 20 κλήζω δ' οὔνομα σόν, Ὡρ', ὃν Μοιρῶν ἰσάριθμον·

¹⁷⁵ On this deity, typical of the magical milieu, see Delatte 1914 (and Delatte in DD, 42–9); Preisendanz 1926; Bonner 1950, 164–5, 297–8, no. 267; Meeks 1991; Berlandini 1993; Saragoza 2009.

¹⁷⁶ I.10–16.

- αχαῖφωθωθωφιαχααῖη ἡῖαιηῖαθωθωφιαχα·
 ἴλαθί μοι, προπάτωρ, κόσμου θάλος, αὐτολόχευτε,
 πυρφόρε, χρυσοφαῖ, φαεσίμβροτε, δέσποτα κόσμου,
 25 δαῖμον ἀκοιμήτου πυρός, ἄφθιτε, χρυσεόκυκλε,
 φέγγος ἀπ' ἀκτίνων καθαρὸν πέμπων ἐπὶ γαῖαν·
- B ἀλλὰ φύλαξον ἅπαν δέμας ἄρτιον εἰς φάος ἔλθεῖν.
 καί μοι μηνυσάτω ὁ δεῖνα τὸ τίς ἢ πόθεν, ἧ δύναταί μοι
 20 νῦν εἰς ὑπηρεσίαν, καὶ τὸν χρόνον, ὃν παρεδρεύει.
 ταῦτα γὰρ αὐτὸς ἔδωκας, ἄναξ, ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δαῖναι·
 ὅτι ἐπικαλοῦμαι τετραμερές σου τοῦνομα· χθεθωῖνι λαῖλαμ ἰαω
 ζουχεπιπτοη.
 κληῖζω δ' οὔνομα σόν, Ὡρ', ὃν Μοιρῶν ἰσάριθμον·
 αχαῖφωθωθωαῖηιαηαῖ ἰαηαῖηῖαωθωθωφιαχα (γράμματα λς').
 25 ἴλαθί μοι, προπάτωρ, κόσμου πάτερ αὐτογένεθλε.

1 ανεμοφοιτητων, B; αεροφοιτατων, C; εποχουμενον, A; επωχουμενοσ, C 2 διεπων πυροσ, B; ακαματον φωσ, C 3 αιθεριαισι τριβαισ, A; αιθεριαισ τροπαισ μεγασ {μεγασ} πολον αμφισ ελαων, C 4 γεν(ν)ων αυτοσ απα(ν)τα, οπερ, C; τάπερ, MT 5 εξ ου γαρ στοιχεια παντα, A; εξ ου γαρ πεφυγε στοιχια, C 6 τρεπων, A; τρεφουσιν, B; κοσμον απαν(τα) τρεπουσι, τετρατροπον, C 7-9 In A the order is 8, 9, 7: the sense does not change 7 μακαρ σε γαρ κληζω, A 8 γαιησ τε χασιο και αἶδαο, A 10 και νυν δη σε λιταζομαι, B; λίτομαι, μάκαρ, MT trying to fit the metre 11 ην γεης, C; επιχωρων, A; ενι χωρω, C 12 Pr (hymns); μεσάταισιν, MT; τουτον τη 4 (δεινα) μεσταισι, A; τουτον οπως μεσταισι, B; πεμψον μαντιν εξ αδυτων τον αληθεα, C 13-14 in A the order of the two verses is inverted 13 σαισ επαναγκαισ, A 14 τοτε λιψανον, A 14-15 οὔπερ ἀπὸ (κεφαλῆς) σκήνους κατέχω τόδε· | καὶ φρασάτω μοι, τῷ δεῖνα, ὅσα θέλω γνῶμαισιν, | ἴν' ἀληθείη καταλέξῃ, B; οὔπερ ἀπὸ σκήνους κατέχω τόδε, καὶ φρασάτω μοι | ὅσα θέλω γνῶμῃσιν, ἀληθείην καταλέξας, MT 15 ην οσα, A 16 πραυν μειλιχιον, A; φρονεοντα, A 17 ιεραῖς ἐπαιοιδαῖς, MT; κρατεραισ επ εμαισ επαιοιδαισ, A 18B ἄρκιον, MT following the parallel in I 323 (= 1.28) 19B ο 4 (δεινα) τοτι, P; ὁ δεῖνα τὸ τίς, Pr (hymns); μηνυσάτω τὸ τίς, MT 20A ωρων, P; εισαριθμον, P;

HYMN TO HELIOS-HORUS

ὥρων Μοίραις , MT 20B ὥρη (ὑπουργῆσαι), καὶ τὸν χρόνον,
 MT 23A πορφυρε, P 23B ὠρων, P; εἴσαριθμον, P; ὥρων
 Μοίραις , MT

Translation

- You who are carried by the breezes of the air-wandering winds,
 golden-haired Helios, who rule the flame's indefatigable fire,
 who wrap up the great pole in ethereal paths,
 who generate all things yourself and all things in their turn dissolve;
 5 for the elements have been arranged by you in relation to your laws
 which nourish all the cosmos which is of four turns per year.
 Listen, blessed one: I call you, the ruler of the sky,
 earth and chaos and Hades where dwell
 the daimons of men who once saw the light.
 10 Even now I beg you, blessed one, immortal, master of the cosmos:
 if you go in the recesses of the earth, in the region of the dead,
 send me this daimon at the midnight hours that
 he may come to orders by your constraint,
 daimon from whose corpse I hold these remains in my hands,
 15 so that he fulfils for me all the things that I want in my heart,
 and may he be gentle, benevolent, not thinking anything against me,
 and may you not be indignant at my sacred charms;
- A for you yourself arranged these things among mankind for them to
 learn
 the threads of the Moirai with your advices.
 20 I call your name, Horus, equal in number to the Moirai:
 ACHAIPHŌTHŌTHŌPHIACHAAIĒĒIA IAĒĒIATHŌTHŌPHIACHA;
 be propitious to me, first father, scion of the cosmos, who gave birth
 to himself,
 fire-bringer, gold-shining, who give light to mortals, master of the
 cosmos,
 daimon of the indefatigable fire, immortal, with gold disc,
 25 who sends on earth pure light from beams.
- B but mind the whole body comes to light intact.
 And may he, NN, reveal to me the 'who' and 'whence', by which now
 he can

- 20 do me this service, and when he is my assistant.
 For you yourself gave these things for mankind to learn;
 because I invoke your four-part name: CHTHETHŌNI LAILAM IAŌ
 ZOUCHEPIPTOĒ.
 I call your name, Horus, equal in number to the Moirai:
 ACHAIPHŌTHŌTHŌAIĒIAĒAI IAĒAIĒIAŌTHŌTHŌPHIACHA (36 letters).
 25 Be propitious to me, first father, father of the cosmos, self-engendered.

COMMENTARY

1 Ἄεροφοιτήτων¹⁷⁷ ἀνέμων ἐποχούμενος αὐραῖς: The phrase seems to be a poetic image depicting the course of the sun and probably it should not necessitate any further speculation. However, we saw in 1.11 how the cosmic conception of the god involves the air or the wind too, and it is important to remember that in Egyptian tradition Amun-Re – especially – not only ‘is’ the wind, but is also a ‘god of the winds’. He can be called simply *tʒw*, ‘wind’, or *tʒw-ndm*, ‘the pleasant wind’, or *swḥ-mn-m-ḥt-nbt*, ‘the wind that endures in everything’, but also *ir-tʒw*, ‘who creates the wind’, or *nb-tʒw*, ‘the lord of the wind’.¹⁷⁸ This stress on the winds in a hymn to Helios could have been fostered by an Egyptian background in which the supreme deity was already thought to be both a solar and an air god at the same time. In fact, in the *Homeric Hymn* to Apollo (3.389–439), the description of the god controlling the course of the ship of the Cretans (also with the help of Zeus) in order to lead them to Delphi to be the ministers of his cult remains an isolated instance and does not seem enough to state that Apollo was considered a god of the winds.

¹⁷⁷ Exclusively attested in the *PGM* (cf. V 252); for its variant ἀερόφοιτος/ἡερόφοιτος used to describe the winds, *OH* 81.1, 82.4. Cf. III 258 for the similar ἀεροδρόμος, ‘running in the air’, in the fragmentary hymn to Apollo (cf. **Intro.** p. 54).

¹⁷⁸ *LGG (Imn)* VIII.54.A.5, 68.A.5, VII.454 (*tʒw*), 457 (*tʒw-ndm*), VI.221 (*swḥ-mn-m-ḥt-nbt*), I.504 (*ir-tʒw*), III.783 (*nb-tʒw*). Further on *tʒw* at 4.1, 3; Fauth 1995, 65–6. Kurth, *LdÄ* ‘Wind’ D, G.

2 Ἥλιε χρυσοκόμα: The epithet χρυσοκόμης, though sporadically used for other deities, is typical of Apollo,¹⁷⁹ and also typically Greek, as Egyptians imagined their gods with lapis lazuli hair, i.e. blue hair.¹⁸⁰ A ‘golden-haired Helios’ is not attested in earlier literature, and thus his presence in the hymn must be due to the Apollo-Helios identification (see 1.7–9).

διέπων φλογὸς ἀκάματον πῦρ: Helios is the lord of the sun, i.e. ‘the flame’s indefatigable fire’.¹⁸¹ The adjective ἀκάματος qualifying ‘fire’ is originally used by Homer¹⁸² to describe a quality of fire itself, without any cosmological reference to the light of the sun. Otherwise, the variant ἀκάμας can be applied directly to the sun as continuously encircling the earth.¹⁸³ Thus, here the Homeric phrase seems to be reused and adapted to a new context, as often in the *PGM*. In particular, it could recall the expression ‘which is never extinguished’ that we find in the *PDM* in relation to solar deities: ‘the companion of the flame, he is the one whose mouth is the flame which is never extinguished, the great god who is seated in the flame, he who is in the midst of the flame which is in the Lake of Heaven (metaphorical term referring to midday)’.¹⁸⁴ These *PDM* images have precedents in earlier Egyptian literature, where the ambivalent symbolism of

¹⁷⁹ E.g. Pind. *Ol.* 7.32; Eur. *Supp.* 975, *Tr.* 254; Bacchyl. *Epin.* 4.2; Aristoph. *Av.* 217; *OH* 34.9. Various examples in Furley and Bremer 2001, see index and especially 10.4.1237 with commentary in II 325.

¹⁸⁰ For the ‘blue hair’ of the gods in Homer and in Egyptian tradition, Drew Griffith 2005.

¹⁸¹ The substitution of πῦρ with φῶς, ‘light’, in C makes the reference to the sun even clearer. The same phrase is found in 12.5, 15.26, but with ἔχω replacing διέπω: here the equivalence fire-sun is lost and the expression refers to the torches traditionally held by the goddess Hecate.

¹⁸² In the same metrical *sedes* as here, e.g. *Il.* 5.4, 15.371, 16.122; *Od.* 20.123, 21.181.

¹⁸³ *Il.* 18.239, 484. Also e.g. *HH* 31.7; Hes. *Th.* 956; Dorotheus Sidonius, fr. 3a.1.2: ἀκάμας is a ‘standard’ epithet of the sun; also *IG IV*² 1.129, where the epithet appears in a quote from Homer, see Furley and Bremer 2001, 6.7.9 and commentary, 7.4.5 in II 225; Ps.-Manetho, *Apotel.* 4.93, 271; *OH* 8.3.

¹⁸⁴ *PDM* xiv 128 [V 12–13], 195 [VII 8–9], 490–91 [XVII 1–2], 517–18 [XVII 27–8].

the fire (see 1.33) is expressed through epithets implying both its sun-light equivalence and its destructive power. For example, Re can be called ‘the blazing one’ or ‘the lord of the flame’; likewise, Amun is the ‘lord of the flame against his enemies’.¹⁸⁵ At the same time, the solar god himself can be described as ‘indefatigable’ – exactly as in Greek literature – with epithets such as *nm-wrḏ-n.f*, ‘for whom there is no tiredness’, or *ḫwtj-nmw.f*, ‘his tiredness does not exist’.¹⁸⁶

3 C has the variant αἰθερίαις τροπαῖς μέγαν πόλον ἀμφὶς ἐλάων, ‘who drive around the great pole in ethereal turns’. The ‘heavenly’ context and the presence of the adjective μέγας seem to suggest that πόλος here means simply ‘sky’, ‘vault of heaven’, and not ‘axis of the universe’.¹⁸⁷ On the other hand, ἀμφιελίσσω, or ἀμφίς, seems to insist on the idea of turning around something still. In any case, it should be intended more as a poetical image describing the course of the sun than as a precise allusion to the geocentric model. In the oracle given by Amun to Alexander about the foundation of Alexandria, Aion Plutonium, i.e. Sarapis, is the one ἀτέρμονα κόσμον ἐλίσσων.¹⁸⁸ Here the sense is more ambiguous, as ἐλίσσω could either mean that the god ‘makes revolve’ or ‘wraps up, turns around’ the endless cosmos. Though the first interpretation is attractive, the second would better fit the Aion identification as Eternity exemplified in the endless cyclic movement of the sun (see 1.15).¹⁸⁹

4 γεννῶν αὐτὸς ὅπαντα, ὕπερ πάλιν ἐξαναλύεις: This phrase, both at a stylistic and conceptual level, seems to reproduce the

¹⁸⁵ And similar epithets, see *LGG* (R^v) VIII.306–8.A.2; e.g. Piankoff 1964, 13; P. Cairo 58032, 14–15 (Amun).

¹⁸⁶ *LGG* III.485, I.162. ¹⁸⁷ LSJ, 3.

¹⁸⁸ *Histor. Alex.* α 1.30.6, 33.2. Cf. Stambaugh 1972, 28, 84–5; Zuntz 1988; cf. *RICIS* 202/1801.138–40 for a similar image in connection with Isis riding the sun chariot.

¹⁸⁹ For ἐλίσσω referring to the course of the sun even when meaning ‘to make revolve’, e.g. Mesom. *GDRK* fr. 2.13–14; Nonn. *Dion.* 40.372; cf. e.g. Greg. Naz. *Carm. dog.* 411.7, *Carm. de se* 1345.10 (with no solar connotation, God is the one κόσμον ἐλίσσων); Gigli Piccardi 1990, 121. On the control of the universe by the sun god through *phr*, ‘encircling’, Ritner 1993, 57–67.

pattern of some common Egyptian expressions describing how the supreme god who created everything will also be the one who will destroy his creation. For example, speaking of Amun, 'who has created the beginning, for whom the end came into existence', or 'he came in the beginning, he gave completion to the end' (cf. line 5); the same pattern can also be found in iatromagical texts where this creative/destructive power of the god is applied to less universal contexts, such as neutralizing poison (equated with fire): 'Ptah is he who made it (the poison), and it is he who will pacify it, Re is he who fashioned it, and it is he who will extinguish it, the god is the one who despatched it, and it is he who will drive it away'.¹⁹⁰ In Chapter 175 of *The Book of the Dead*, another creator god, Atum, says: 'I will destroy all that I have made . . . the earth shall return to the primordial water.' Another phrase used to describe solar-creator gods is 'life and death are in his hands'.¹⁹¹ Although it can refer to the power the god exerts over human destiny, the underlying idea is the same as in our passage: as the god can create and destroy everything he can also decide on the life or death of an individual.

In Greek philosophy, this equation between the creative and destructive principles was especially developed by the Stoics in their theorization of a periodical conflagration of the universe, where the creative/destructive fire was identified with the universal Reason (λόγος) and with Zeus.¹⁹² They were possibly drawing on Heraclitus, to whom are attributed maxims such as ἐκ πυρὸς γὰρ τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς πῦρ πάντα τελευτᾷ, 'everything comes from fire and in fire everything reaches its end'.¹⁹³ Even if, in spite of Zeus' involvement, the Stoics used the supreme god more as an allegorical image of

¹⁹⁰ 'Tura hymn', 4; P. Cairo 58032, 30; Leitz 1999, BM EA 10309, I.8–9.

¹⁹¹ E.g. Traunecker 1992, 222, 42.4; O. Cairo 25208, 7. For a similar epithet (also of Amun) found in Ptolemaic temples see Kurth et al. 1998.

¹⁹² Salles 2009a; Long 2006, 256–82.

¹⁹³ Heraclit. *Test.* 5.8–9 (Diels and Kranz). Long 1996, especially 40–4.

the λόγος than as an actual deity,¹⁹⁴ we could imagine a Stoic echo in our hymn thanks to an equivalence fire-solar god.

However, it is once again Orphic literature that provides us with the most interesting parallels to the line in question. When in the *Laws* Plato quotes an ‘old tradition’ according to which ‘god holds the beginning, the end and the centre of all things’, he refers to the Orphic cosmic god as described in the above-mentioned hymn to Zeus (see 1.11).¹⁹⁵ The *OH* contribute other examples: Uranus and Zeus are said to be ‘the beginning of everything, of everything the end’; Apollo is the one who cares ‘about the beginning and the end’.¹⁹⁶ The same pattern is found in Christian literature, e.g. in the Apocalypse of John: ‘I am the alpha and the omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end.’¹⁹⁷ Of course, this kind of pattern does not necessarily involve ‘the dissolution’ of the creation by the god, but is often used to express the idea that the deity is eternal and rules over everything in the whole cosmos.¹⁹⁸ For the same expression used in connection with Hecate see 15.32–6.

¹⁹⁴ As happens with the Lucretian Venus in Epicureanism (Asmis 1982). Cleanthes’ hymn to Zeus describes the god as the ‘first cause’ of the universe but does not mention anything about his alleged ability to destroy his creation.

¹⁹⁵ Plato, *Lg.* 715e8; cf. Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 31; François 1957, 158–9. There are several variants of the Orphic hymn to Zeus: in some cases at line 2 instead of Ζεὺς κεφαλὴ, Ζεὺς μέσση (‘Zeus head, Zeus centre’) we find Ζεὺς ἀρχή, Ζεὺς μέσση (‘Zeus is the beginning, Zeus is the centre’), which would be the source of Plato’s remark. For this variant, e.g. Plu. *De defect.* 436d9, *De commun.* 1074e3; Procl. *Theol. Plat.* 6.40.3. Also in the Judaeo-Christian hymn attributed to Orpheus (see 1.10 and I n.52), Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 378.35: ἀρχὴν αὐτὸς ἔχων καὶ μέσσην ἡδὲ τελευτήν, ‘as he is the one holding the beginning, the middle and the end’. See also Van den Broek 1978.

¹⁹⁶ *OH* 4.2, 15.7, 34.15 (though, at least in the case of Uranus, the epithet refers to the extension of the sky and not to the creation and destruction of the universe). Rudhardt 2008, 263–6.

¹⁹⁷ NT, *Apoc.* 22.13.2, cf. 1.8.6, 21.6.2.

¹⁹⁸ Dornseiff 1988, 75–8, 122–5.

5 C has the metrically faulty variant ἐξ οὗ γὰρ πέφυκε στοιχεῖα τεταγμένα σοῖσι νόμοισι, 'by whom were generated the elements arranged according to your laws'. Apart from the Hellenistic touch of στοιχεῖα,¹⁹⁹ this phrase resembles some Egyptian hymnic passages addressed to various creator gods. Some examples: 'who shaped the earth according to his heart's designs' (Ptah);²⁰⁰ 'who organized the land through the order he issued', 'who first created the world as his plan';²⁰¹ and, particularly interesting as a parallel to lines 4–5, 'he came in the beginning, he gave completion to the end, he made the earth begin according to his designs' (Amun).²⁰²

6 Egyptian solar-creator gods are often described as cosmic 'nourishers'²⁰³ and a prose parallel to our passage is found in Diodorus Siculus,²⁰⁴ who, talking about Osiris (the sun) and Isis (the moon), tells us that in Egyptian religious tradition these gods 'regulate the entire universe (σύμπαντα κόσμον), nourishing (τρέφοντας) and increasing all things by three seasons which complete the full cycle through an unobservable movement'. Similarly, in our verse the cosmos is described as a temporal unity in which a year is likely to represent a complete cycle. This cycle is said to be of 'four turning points', which could be the four seasons, or more precisely the two equinoxes and solstices. If seasons are intended, a comparison with Egyptian tradition could be difficult because the Egyptian calendar was divided into three seasons in accordance with the agricultural cycle regulated by the inundation of the Nile.²⁰⁵ On the other hand, solstices and equinoxes were well known to the Egyptians, and the number four had great importance in Egyptian mythology

¹⁹⁹ Dieterich 1891, 56–62.

²⁰⁰ P. Berlin 3048, III.1.

²⁰¹ P. Cairo 58032, 29; Leitz 1999, BM EA 10042, IV.6.

²⁰² P. Cairo 58032, 30–1.

²⁰³ See **Intro.** p. 46; Assmann 2001a, 57–60.

²⁰⁴ Diod. Sic. 1.11.5, drawing from Hecat. Abd. *FGrH* fr. 25.33–5; cf. also Plu. fr. 190.11–14 (Sandbach); Euseb. *PE* 3.3.1; Jo. Malal. *Chronog.* 56.8.

²⁰⁵ E.g. Parker 1974, especially 52–3.

and rituals, as, owing to its connection with the four cardinal points and four regions of the universe, it symbolized perfection, the completeness of the cosmos.²⁰⁶ In any case the phrase seems to allude again to the cosmic nature of the god, since equating the cosmos with the cyclical movements of the sun on the ecliptic sounds very much like identifying the cosmos with the solar deity.

7 κλῦθι, μάκαρ· κλήζω σε: see 1.20.

7–8 See 1.20–1.

8–9 This passage, partially missing in 1, confirms that the magician is about to invoke the spirit of a dead person (δαίμονες ἀνθρώπων) and reinforces the interpretation of the passage ‘mind the whole body come to light effective/intact’ in 1.28 (here line 18B). The dead dwelling in Hades are described as those ‘who once saw the light’ in accordance with the earlier poetic tradition in which ‘to see the light’ is metaphorically used for ‘to be alive’. Of course the Egyptian Netherworld was imagined as a dark place too, but every night the sun god traversed it, illuminating all its inhabitants. Therefore, our phrase does not seem to reflect an Egyptian depiction of the Netherworld.²⁰⁷

10 λίτομαί σε: Together with the form λίσσομαι, common invocation pattern in Greek poetry,²⁰⁸ also frequently found in the *OH*.²⁰⁹

ἄφθιτε: Common, especially poetic, epithet of gods since Homer, but not attested in the vocative before the first/second century.²¹⁰

²⁰⁶ Cf. Wells 1992. On the number four, Sethe 1916, 31–2; De Wit 1957, 35–9; Raven 2005; cf. Goyon 1987, 58–60.

²⁰⁷ E.g. see the description of the sun enlightening the Netherworld in the tomb of Ramesses VI in Darnell 2004, 211–12 and pl. 24–5A (cf. Quack 2005b, 30).

²⁰⁸ E.g. *HH* 16.5; Sappho, fr. 1.2 (Lobel and Page); Hippon. fr. 40.2 (West); Eur. *Hel.* 900; *AP* 5.165.1.

²⁰⁹ E.g. *OH* 5.6, 10.29, 41.9. Cf. 12.38.

²¹⁰ E.g. *OH* 10.5, 15.1; Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 691.5; Synes. *Hym.* 7.20; Procl. *Hym.* 6.3, 15; *AP* 9.615.9, 16.369.3.

δέσποτα κόσμου: Here the generic **δέσποτα** is combined with **κόσμου**, forming one of the characteristic epithets of the supreme deities in the *PGM* (see 1.3). Not surprisingly, this combination is attested only after the first century when it starts to appear in Hermetic, Orphic and especially Judaeo-Christian literature.²¹¹ In this case too it is possible to find an earlier Egyptian equivalent: *nb r-dr*, ‘the lord of all’, often, but not especially, attributed to Amun.²¹²

11 At 1.23 (here line 12), the Egyptian Netherworld journey of the solar deity seemed the necessary prerequisite for the nightly constraining of the daimon. The hypothesis is confirmed by this line, where the magician clearly assumes that the solar god will traverse the Netherworld at a certain stage.

12–17 See 1.22–7. C has the variant **πέμψον μάντιν ἐξ ἀδύτων τὸν ἀληθέα**, ‘send the truthful prophet from the inaccessible place’.

18–19A(21B) See 1.29. The threads of the Moirai are the past, the present and the future, and represent human fate: the god taught men the art of prophecy and possibly how to influence their destiny with magic.

20–1A(23–4B) See 1.30–1. In this version the god is called Horus, the Egyptian solar falcon god, son of Osiris and Isis, who claimed the inheritance of his father against his brother Seth and thus obtained the right to sovereignty, becoming the symbol of divine/human kingship.²¹³ In A the palindrome is misspelled and B adds ‘36 characters’ to avoid possible mistakes.

22A (25B) ἵλαθί μοι, προπάτωρ: See 1.32.

κόσμου θάλος: The poetic word **θάλος** conveys both the idea of something that sprouts, shoots from a plant, and the

²¹¹ E.g. Philo, *De sobr.* 55.2; *Corp.Herm.* fr. 23.29.10; *OH* 8.16; Hippol. *Refut.* 5.16.10.1.

²¹² E.g. ‘Tura hymn’, 2, 4; all the attestations in *LGG* III.795–6; Westendorf, *LdÄ* ‘Allherr’.

²¹³ Schenkel, *LdÄ* ‘Horus’, A–C.

meaning ‘child’, and is used from Homer onwards to denote a line of descent.²¹⁴ It is not immediately clear why a god described as the ‘first father’ and the ‘master of the cosmos’ should be called ‘child’, ‘scion’. From the ‘Greek’ point of view, we could think of Helios (line 2) as the son of Hyperion, but the epithet says explicitly ‘scion of the cosmos’; alternatively, a Christian influence could be hypothesized, but $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ is never used for Christ. On the other hand, the deity is called also Horus (lines 20A, 23B), and the Egyptian god of kingship was ‘the child’ *par excellence*: the child of the god Osiris. Horus can appear in child form (e.g. *Hr-ḥ3-ḥrd*, ‘Horus the child’, i.e. ‘Harpocrates’) as manifestation of the new-born solar god – i.e. as sun at dawn – and, generally, every solar deity can have a ‘child manifestation’, often embodied by a separate child god (e.g. Ihy at Edfu, Harsomtut at Dendera).²¹⁵

The Egyptian symbolic conception also created other representations of the sun at dawn, among them the lotus flower. This idea probably developed from observation of the blue Egyptian water lily (*Nymphaea caerulea*), whose flowers close and go underwater during the night, to open up again, emerging from the water, in the morning. Since every new dawn is conceived as a re-enacting of the coming into being of the solar god at the beginning of time, every symbol of the sun at dawn has a special connection with the primordially of creation. Originally, the idea of the child sun god Re (a scarab or a serpent in other variants) emerging from the primordial lotus flower in the middle of the primeval ocean was part of the Hermopolitan cosmogony.²¹⁶ Subsequently, this image started to be used in relation to the majority of solar deities in their child form – or animal form (e.g. scarab,

²¹⁴ Hom. *Il.* 22.87 (Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad loc.*); Pind. *Ol.* 2.45, 6.68; Eur. *IT* 171, 209. See Furley and Bremer 2001, 2.6.1.25 with commentary and 7.7.1.1.

²¹⁵ Brunner, *LdA* ‘Götter, Kinder’.

²¹⁶ Sauneron and Yoyotte 1959, 54–9; cf. Weidner 1985, 106–13. Cf. Zivie-Coche 2009, and especially 190–1, 199–200, for the lotus flower.

serpent) – as a metaphor for the primeval/daily birth of the sun, and it could also be directly applied to the solar gods themselves who did not have to ‘emerge from’ a lotus, but could also ‘be’ lotus flowers (see 5.3).²¹⁷ The coming into being of the child solar gods from the lotus flower became a typical motif in the decoration and theology of Ptolemaic temples.²¹⁸

An Egyptian background explains the choice of ‘scion of the cosmos’ here for a deity otherwise described as solar and primordial, since the child/lotus is a manifestation of the solar god and does not imply that he has to be the ‘son’ of someone else. This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the parallel in 1.32 where, instead of κόσμου θάλος, we find προγενέστερε, another epithet expressing the primordality of the deity.

αὐτολόχευτε: Like αὐτογένεθλος (see 1.32), αὐτολόχευτος conveys the idea of self-generation: it is a late formation and does not seem to be attested before the fourth century.²¹⁹ Although the lexicographers tell us that it means αὐτογέννητος, ‘self-engendered’, or ἀγέννητος, ‘unoriginated’ (a common attribute of God in Christian theology),²²⁰ the epithet, at least originally, refers to the action of self-delivery (λοχεύω, ‘to bring forth, deliver’). This idea is very frequently found in Egyptian hymnography expressed by the divine epithet *ms-sw-(ds.f)*, literally ‘who gave birth to himself (by himself)’,²²¹ formed with the participle of the verb *ms*, ‘to bear, give birth, be delivered of’, the third-person masculine pronoun *sw* and, sometimes, the reflexive *ds.f*. Its final meaning is similar to *hpr-ds.f*, ‘self-engendered’, but it is formed with a verb whose first meaning is specifically ‘to give birth (to)’, as the determinative of the


²¹⁷ *LdÄ*, ‘Lotos’; Weidner 1985, 117–20; DD, 106.

²¹⁸ Cf. Budde 2003, 47–50; Ryhiner 1986, *passim*.

²¹⁹ Apart perhaps from *Orac. Sib.* 1.20.

²²⁰ E.g. Hesych. A.8431; Phot. A.3228; Suda, A.4506.

²²¹ *LGG* III.411–12. See Zandee 1992, especially 175–6, 181.

woman giving birth, , indicates. Thus, this is another example of a Greek compound likely to represent a translation from an Egyptian participial phrase.

23Α πυρφόρε: This epithet is traditionally used in a descriptive rather than a metaphorical way: Zeus can be *πυρφόρος* owing to the ‘fire-bringer’ lightning, or Prometheus, for obvious reasons, or Demeter and Artemis as ‘torch-bearers’,²²² which is understandable given that the first meaning of *πυρφορέω* is ‘to carry a torch’. Here, in close proximity to *χρυσοφαής*, it seems to have again a solar connotation absent in earlier literature (cf. line 2).²²³

χρυσοφαῖ: The sun is *χρυσοφαής* already in Euripides,²²⁴ and Apollo as a solar deity is ‘gold-shining’ in 8.23.²²⁵ The same image is described in Egyptian by epithets such as *wbn-m-nbw*, ‘who rises like gold’ (e.g. Amun-Re), *psd-m-nbw*, ‘who shines like gold’ (e.g. Horus).²²⁶

φαισίμβροτε: Another solar epithet: attested since Homer in relation to the dawn or the sun, it is frequently found in the *OH*.²²⁷ Many are the possible Egyptian equivalents, from *shd-twy*, ‘who enlightens the Two Lands’, to *nh-hrw-n-mzwt.f*, ‘men live thanks to his beams’ (e.g. Amun-Re).²²⁸

δέσποτα κόσμου: See 1.3, 2.10.

24Α δαῖμον ἀκοιμήτου πυρός: As in line 2, we are dealing with the eternal light of the sun.²²⁹

²²² LSJ, II.1; e.g. Zeus: Soph. *Ph.* 1198; *OH* 44.4, 47.4; Prometheus: Soph. *OC* 55; Demeter: Eur. *Supp.* 260, *Ph.* 687.

²²³ Cf. Ps.-Manetho, *Apotel.* 6.692, where Mars is ‘the fiery planet’ (*πυρφόρος*) owing to its colour.

²²⁴ Eur. *Hec.* 636.

²²⁵ Cf. Ps.-Manetho, *Apotel.* 2.383, 6.366 where Mercury is the ‘gold-shining’ planet.

²²⁶ *LGG* II.313–14, III.123–4.

²²⁷ West 1966, *ad Hes. Th.* 958; Eur. *Heracl.* 750; *OH* 34.8 (Apollo), 66.2 (Hephaestus’ fire), 78.1; Orph. *Arg.* 1078, 1105; see also the second hymn to Telesphoros in Furley and Bremer 2001, 7.7.2.1. Cf. 15.3.

²²⁸ *LGG* VI.484, II.157.

²²⁹ Cf. Melito, *TrGF* fr. 8b.1.29.

χρυσεόκυκλε: This epithet is attested only here and once in Euripides,²³⁰ but it finds some correspondence in Egyptian solar theology where the solar disc is often mentioned as representing the physical appearance of the god. For example, the solar god can be *itm-n-nbw*, ‘the golden solar disc’, or *itm-nfr*, ‘the beautiful solar disc’, Amun is the one ‘who shines in his disc who comes forth from the primeval water to illumine the lands’ (see line 25A),²³¹ and in the *PDM* Horus is the ‘lord of the disc . . . the great god who is in the disc’.²³²

25A φέγγος ἀπ’ ἀκτίνων καθαρὸν πέμπων ἐπὶ γαῖαν: Given the proximity of χρυσεόκυκλος,²³³ the phrase seems to echo a common Egyptian pattern used in the description of solar deities. Some examples: Horus at Dendera is ‘the great solar disc who shines in the morning’ or ‘the beautiful solar disc who shines in gold, the great enlightener who enlightens the Two Lands with his beams’;²³⁴ not surprisingly also Amun-Re can be *shd-tzwy-m-stwt.f*, the one ‘who enlightens the Two Lands with his beams’.²³⁵

18B See 1.28.

19B Lines 19 and 20 have been added to adapt the hymn to the specific magical procedure described in B: acquiring as assistant the spirit of one who had a violent death. The spirit is supposed to tell the magician who he is and where he comes from, information that is needed to acquire power over the spirit and thus control it (see **Intro.** n.59).

21B See 1.29 and 1.1 for ἄναξ.

22B χθεθωινι λαῖλαμ ιαω ζουχεπιπτοη: The second word seems to come from the Hebrew *lailam* (לַיִל, ‘night’, probably

²³⁰ Eur. *Ph.* 176.

²³¹ *LGG* I.616; ‘Tura hymn’, 9.

²³² *PDM* xiv 241–2 [IX 2–3].

²³³ Cf. Philo, *De somn.* 1.114.1: σοι τὸ ἱερὸν φέγγος ὁ θεὸς ἀκτινοβολεῖ, ‘for you the God sends the divine light with beams’, but obviously with no mention of the sun disc.

²³⁴ D I 149.15; DMamm. 126.17–18: *itm nfr psd m nbw shd wr shd tzwy m stwt.f*.

²³⁵ *LGG* VI.489.

CONCLUSIONS TO 1 AND 2

followed by the adverb ending *ām*), ‘at night’,²³⁶ contrary to the common scholarly opinion (which derives it from the Hebrew or Aramaic *la’olam* or *la’alam* meaning ‘forever’),²³⁷ while no certain explanation has been found for *χθεθωινι*. On the other hand *ζουχεπιπτοη* is a by-formation of *οὐχ ἐπὶ πτόη*, ‘not in a state of excitement’, mistaken for a proper name.²³⁸ For *Iao* see 1.5.

25B κόσμου πάτερ: See 1.10. The epithet is analogous to *δέσποτα κόσμου* (lines 10, 23A) but focuses on the creative/primordial aspect (cf. 1.32).

αὐτογένεθλε: See 1.32.

CONCLUSIONS TO 1 AND 2

Hymn 1 after a traditional opening (lines 1–4) presents a long section rich in Judaeo-Christian elements (lines 5–18), which, owing to the appearance of some of its verses in 3 (3.14–17, 23, 29), was probably part of a pre-existing composition. In spite of the Judaeo-Christian background, the passage was adapted to fit the new context and, in its present state, there are various details that do not fit Judaeo-Christian theology: the necessity to specify that God is ‘Zeus’ (line 5); the ‘first messenger’ *Iao* or *Gabriel* (lines 5, 7); the insistence on solar themes (lines 8–9, 17); the conception of the cosmic god (lines 11, 16); and finally the fact that the listed entries seem to be used in the hymn as ‘names’, ‘symbols’ of the same god invoked (lines 5–10, 11–18). The whole section serves as a sort of *epiclēsis* ending at line 21 as in 2.1–10: both passages are directly followed by an *euchē* which, owing to the specific references to the magical context, leaves no doubt about its *ad hoc* composition (1.22–31, 2.11–21A, 11–25B). 1 adds the releasing invocation rich in Egyptian elements (lines 32–7), and both 2.22–5A and the final verse of

²³⁶ Quack, in press.

²³⁷ E.g. BG; Mastrocinque 2003, 102.

²³⁸ Waldstein and Wisse 1995, 109, II 18, 18–19.

2B display various divine attributes with a possible Egyptian origin.

In both cases, when portraying the deity, a proper narrative is missing. In fact, even if there are not only participial but also verbal phrases, they do not describe a real mythology (actions in time) or proper powers of the god, but the aspects of the solar-creator deity cyclically re-enacting themselves. The statements of 1.6, 8–10, 17 and 2.1–6 are ‘always true’ and do not refer to any special divine competence, but to the ‘essential’ nature of the god. Thus, in spite of their syntactical pattern, they serve as divine epithets, not as narrative. The only exception could be the acknowledgement that the god taught men the art of prophecy (1.29, 2.18–19A, 21B).

In view of the conclusions drawn at 1.22–8, the hymn does not seem to have been composed for a dream oracle. In three cases the aim is clearly stated: evoking the spirit of a specific dead person. Then, slight lexical changes create different shades of meaning according to the final goal of the procedure.²³⁹ When part of the hymn is used in a dream oracle (2C), the *euchē* is drastically cut and, instead of a δαίμων, the solar god has to send a μάντις, but even in this case the ‘prophet’ is the spirit of a dead person (2.11–12C). While invoking the solar Apollo to obtain a prophecy would have perfectly fitted Greek tradition, the same cannot be said for the god imagined as going into the Underworld and sending a dead spirit, since Greek necromantic rituals involved chthonic deities, not solar (see 1.23 and general Conclusions).²⁴⁰ At the same time, neither the traditional Apollo nor the Hellenistic Helios fit with the idea of a cosmic and primordial creator god. Again, the Judaeo-Christian God, though primordial creator and ruler of all the cosmos, is a transcendent deity (not cosmic-immanent), and would not fit either with the insistence on solar traits or

²³⁹ 1.24–5 (receiving a prophecy); 2.15 (acquiring love); 2.19–20B (acquiring an assistant).

²⁴⁰ Cf. Faraone 2004, 231–2.

CONCLUSIONS TO 1 AND 2

with the god's dominance on, and his moving through, the Netherworld expressed by our hymn.

In conclusion, as far as single epithets or expressions are concerned, no doubt the hymn assembles elements from different religious traditions. However, considering the nature of the deity invoked,²⁴¹ the only context in which all the main attributes are consistent with each other is the Egyptian theology of solar-creator gods. Not surprisingly, various epithets have an Egyptian equivalent (e.g. 1.9, 10, 13, 15, 28, 32 *προγενέστερε*, 2.2 *διέπων φλογός*, 5, 10 *δέσποτα κόσμου*, 23A, 25A, 25B) or sometimes they seem to translate expressions typical of Egyptian hymnography (e.g. 1.11, 20-1, 32, *προπάτωρ*, *αὐτογένεθλε*, 2.4, 22A *αὐτολόχευτε*, 24A), and some passages appear to imply an Egyptian religious background (e.g. 1.23, 33, 35, 36-7, 2.1, 11, 22A *κόσμου θάλος*).

²⁴¹ E.g. the 'Mount Parnassus' and 'Pytho' (1.3) are specifically Apollonian cultic toponyms which appear in the hymn as the god is identified with Apollo, but they are not so relevant when compared with the general conception of the divinity implied by the whole composition.

HYMN 3

HYMN TO HELIOS: III 198–230 (EARLY FOURTH CENTURY)

This hymn appears within an untitled spell (III 187–262) which aims at invoking the god so that he may appear to the magician and answer his questions about the future.

- Preliminaries: The spell lists various ingredients to be ground together into little round pastilles and shows two images to be drawn on a tripod used in the rite.
- Invocation: The **hymn** invokes Helios so that he may send a daimon who will answer the magician's questions.
- Second invocation: A second hymn (III 234–58)²⁴² invokes Apollo so that the god himself may appear.
- Release: The daimon/god is dismissed with a brief formula.

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: MT (Pr reconstructed hymn 5).²⁴³

ἦσυχον ἐν στομάτεσσι πάντες κατερύκετε φ[ωνήν·
αἰθέρος ἀμφίδρομοι σιγὴν ὄρνιθες ἔχοιτε,
σκικτῶντες, δελφῖνες, ὑπὲρ ἁλίοιο παύεσθε, (200)
μείνατέ μοι, ποταμῶν τε ῥοαὶ καὶ νάματα ν[ασμῶν,
5 οἰωνοὶ πτηνοί, νῦν στήσατε πάντα ὑπ' αἴθραν,
ἐρπετὰ φωλ(ε)ιοῖσι βοὴν αἶοντα φοβεῖσθε,
δαίμονες ἐν φθιμέν[ο]ις, σιγὴν τρομέοντες ἔ[χοιτε,
ἀρρήτοις ἔπεσιν κόσμ[ος] ξε[ινί]ζεται αὐτός. (205)
Σημέα βασιλεῦ, κόσμου [γενέτω]ρ, ἐμοὶ ἴλαος ἔ[σσο,

²⁴² The metrical section that will not be analysed here owing to its very fragmentary state, see **Intro.** p. 54.

²⁴³ MT, II.62–76; Heitsch 1960, 150–8 with commentary. Cf. also the edition of Tissi 2013, with commentary, especially for the various reading suggestions for the more fragmentary verses.

- 10 κάν[θαρε, χ]ρυσοκόμην κ[λήζω θεὸν] ἀθάνατόν <σε>, κάν[θαρε, π]ᾶσι θεοῖσι καὶ [ἀνθρώ]ποις μέγα θα[ῦμα, [.]πο[.]επι[.]ινον πυρεσ[δέσποτα ἀν[τολῆς], Τιτάν, πυρόεις ἀνατείλας, σὲ (210)
κλήζω, πρώτι[στ]ον Διὸς ἄγγελον, θε[ῖ]ον Ἰάω,
- 15 καὶ σε, τὸν οὐράγιον κόσμον κατέχοντα, Ῥ[αφαήλ]?, ἀντολῆς χαίρων, θεὸς Ἰλα{ι}ος ἔσ(σ)ο, Ἀβρασά[ξ, καὶ σε, μέγιστε, αἰθέριε, κλήζω ἀ[ρ]ωγόν σου Μ[ιχαήλ καὶ σῶζοντα βί . οσιδι . . αι ὄμμα τέλ[ειον (215)
καὶ φύσιν ἀέξοντα καὶ ἐκ φύσεως φύσιν ἀ[ῖ]θις,
- 20 καὶ κλήζω ἀθανάτων . . . ο . αση . πα σεσε[νγενβ]αρφααραγγης· παντοκράτωρ θεὸς ἐσσι, σὺ δ', ἀθάνατ', ἐσσι μέγ[ιστος· ἱκνοῦμαι, νῦν λάμψον, ἄναξ κόσμοιο, Σα[βαώθ, ὃς δύσιν ἀντολίῃσιν ἐπισκεπάξεις, Ἀδωνα[ί, (220)
κόσμος ἐὼν μόνος κόσμον ἀθανάτων ἐ[φορε]ύεις,
- 25 αὐτομαθῆς, ἀδίδακτος μέσον κόσμον ἐλ[αύνων το[.] νυκτὸς . [.]ερουσγαρ ἡοῦς ακραμμαχ[αρι, κα[.] . ων ἐπιθύματα δά[φνης? καὶ Στυγὸς ἀδ[μήτιο] πύλας καὶ[(225)
ὀρκίζω σε, σφραγίδ[α θ]ε[οῦ], τ[ὸν] πάντες Ὀλύμπου
- 30 ἀθάνατοι φρίσσο[υσι θεοὶ κ]αὶ δαίμονες ἔξοχ' ἄρ[ιστοι κ[αὶ] πέλαγος σιγᾶ [καὶ στ]έλλεται, ὅπ(π)ότ' ἀκο[ύει· ὄτ[ι] ὁ]ρκίζω σε κατ[ὰ τοῦ μ]εγάλου θεοῦ Ἀπ[όλλωνος α]εθίουω.

1 στοματαισι, P; στόμασιν, MT; κατερυκεδε, P 3 ἀλίου, MT; παυεσθαι, P 4 νάματ' αν[αύρω]ν, Bruhn, MT 5 πάντες, MT; εθραν, P 6 φοβεισθαι, P 7 φθιμεν[ο]ιο, P; φθιμέ- νοις, ἔ[χοιτ]ε MT 8 κόσμος ξε[ινί]ζεται, MT 9 ὦ) βασι- λεῦ, MT; ἔ[λθοις, MT 10 κλ[ήζω θεὸν] ἀθάνατον <φῶς>, MT 12 [ἴλαθι, δέσ]πο[τ' ἔχων] ἐπὶ σ[οὶ φλόγ]ινον πυρὸς [ἀτμόν], MT 13 ἀνατελλας, P 13-14 ἀνατείλας. κλήζω, MT 14 πρώτι[στ]ον, MT; πυριν[ο]ν, Pr 15 οὐράγιον κόσ- μον κατέχοντα, Ῥ[αφαήλ, MT 16 χαίρ[ω]ν, θεὸς Ἰλαος ἔσσο, MT 17 μέγιστε <καὶ> αἰθέριε, κλη[ῖ]ζω ἀ[ρ]ωγόν {σου} Μ[ι- χαήλ, MT 18 καὶ σῶζοντα βί[ο]υς ἰδίω(ν), Διὸ[ς] ὄμμα τέλ[ειον, MT 19 διξοντα, P; δεῖξαντα, Pr who, in the reconstruction of the hymn, accepts the emendation ἀέξοντα proposed by R. Wünsch

HYMN TO HELIOS

and L. Fahz, as all the other editors did 20 κλη(ί)ζω ἀθανάτων
 σεσε[νγενβ]αρφααραγγης, MT 21 θεος εστι, P;
 ἀθανατοσσιμεσι[, P 22 ικνουμε, P 23 ἀντολήσιν ἐπισκο-
 πιάεις, MT, as paralleled in I 304 24 κόσμος ἑὼν κόσμον
 μόνος, MT to fit the metre; ἐ[φοδε]ύεις, Pr 25 ἑὼν <περι>
 κόσμον ἐλ[ίσσων, MT 26 το[ίς] νυκτός <σ'> α[ί]ρουσι δι'
 ἡ(χ)οῦς ακραμμαχ[αρι, Pr 27 [χαί]ρων ἐπίθυμα τὸ δά[φνου,
 Pr; κα[]ρων, MT 28 πύλας καὶ Κῆρα λύτ[ειραν, Pr 29 ὄν,
 Pr 30 φρίσσο[υσ' ἰ]δέ, MT, trying to fit the metre; δεμονε-
 ξοχαρ[, P 31 σικα, P; σιγα[ν ἐπιτ]έλλεται, Pr; ὁππότ' ἀκού[ει,
 MT 32 ο]ργιζω, P; ὀ[τι] ὀρκίζω, MT

Translation

All of you, hold your voice quiet in your mouths;
 may the circling birds of the air be silent,
 you dolphins, stop leaping over the brine,
 stand still for me, rivers' streams and torrents' springs.

- 5 Now, winged birds, stop everything under the sky,
 you animals, hearing the cry from your lairs, be afraid,
 daimons among the dead may you be silent trembling with fear;
 the cosmos itself is astonished by the secret words.

- King Semea, father of the cosmos, may you be propitious to me,
 10 scarab, I call you, immortal golden-haired god,
 scarab, great marvel for all gods and men,

...

lord of sunrise, Titan, who rise burning;

I call you, first messenger of Zeus, divine ἰαδ,

- 15 and you, who occupy the heavenly cosmos, RAPHAËL,
 you who rejoice at sunrise, be a propitious god, ABRASAX,
 and you, the greatest one, ethereal, I call your helper, MICHAËL,
 and you who save . . . perfect eye,
 you who made nature develop and (developed) nature in its turn from
 nature,

- 20 and I call . . . of the immortals . . . SESENGENBARPHARAGGĒS;
 you are the god ruler of all, you, immortal, are the greatest;
 I beg, shine now, lord of the cosmos, SABAŌTH,
 you who hide sunset with dawns, ADŌNAI,

HYMN 3

25 who, being a cosmos, alone among immortals observe the cosmos,
 who learnt by yourself, untaught, who drive through the cosmos'
 midst
 at night . . . at dawn, AKRAMMACHARI,
 . . . laurel offerings
 and the doors of untamed Styx and . . .
 I adjure you (by) the god's seal, in front of which all the immortal
 gods of Olympos
 30 shiver and by far the greatest daimons,
 and the sea restrains itself in silence when it hears.
 As I adjure you by the mighty god Apollo
 ΑΕΕΙΟΥΘ.

COMMENTARY

1–8 The magician exhorts all the creatures inhabiting the world to be silent in awe of the invocation he is about to perform and the subsequent epiphany of the god. In spite of some insistence on the magician's role (rivers and torrents have to be still 'for him' and the cosmos is astonished by the 'sacred words'), such a cosmic involvement must be triggered by the divine epiphany itself, as suggested by the mention of the fearsomeness spreading through reptiles and daimons (on cosmic reactions at the god's epiphany as a topos of Apollonian hymnography see 1.10). Thus, a passage originally describing the reactions of Nature at the god's arrival – or at the utterance of the divine 'name' (see lines 29–31) – is likely to have been adjusted to fit the magical context. An interesting parallel is found in the second-century Mesomedes' hymn to Helios, where, even if in different words, the sky, the earth, the sea, winds, mountains, plains and birds are urged to keep silent as Phoibos-Helios is about to rise from the eastern horizon.²⁴⁴

²⁴⁴ *GDRK* fr. 2.1–5: Εὐφαιμέτω πᾶς αἰθήρ, | γῆ καὶ πόντος καὶ
 πνοαί, | οὐρεα, τέμπεα σιγάτω, | ἦχοι φθόγγοι τ' ὀρνίθων· | μέλλει γὰρ
 πορθ' ἡμᾶς βαίνειν | Φοῖβος ἀκερσεκόμας εὐχαίτας, 'Let all the air be

As in our hymn, Mesomedes addresses a solar deity; however, there is no mention of 'fear' and the only living creatures involved are birds. On the contrary, in Ezekiel 38.19–21 when the land of Israel will be attacked by its enemies 'the fish of the sea shall quake at the presence of the Lord, and the birds of the sky, and the wild beasts of the field, and all the animals that creep upon the earth, and all the men that are on the face of the earth; and the mountains shall be rent, and the valleys shall fall'. But here we are dealing with an earthquake-like destruction scene (as suggested by the use of the verb *σειώω* instead of *τρέμω*) and the deity does not have any solar traits.²⁴⁵

Most interestingly, in these descriptions the list of creatures and/or regions does not include the dead or the Underworld. Apparently, the inhabitants of the Netherworld are not supposed to participate either in the awe and praise or in the fear of god, while our hymn mentions also the 'daimons among the dead'. In Greek tradition, as already discussed, a single god is very rarely assigned to rule over all the regions of the cosmos, and the Underworld is generally thought to be a separate realm. This conception seems to be reflected by Mesomedes' hymn where the extent of the cosmos corresponds to the range of the sunlight: the world involved is the one touched by the beams of the sun. On the other hand, in Egyptian tradition the solar god also dispenses his light to the dead while he traverses the Duat every night, and the Netherworld is generally listed with the other regions as the dominion of the same deity (see 1.20–1).

silent, the earth, the sea, the winds; mountains, valleys, echoes and sounds of birds, keep silent! For Phoebus with long and beautiful hair is coming to us.' Heitsch 1960, 144–50, and 152 for a comparison with our hymn; also Tissi 2013, 188–90, for a different interpretation. See Pfister, *RE* Supp. 4 'Epiphanie', 318.45; Pax, *RAC* 'Epiphanie', especially B.I, B.V.

²⁴⁵ Also e.g. LXX, *Ps.* 148.7–13: 'Praise the Lord from the earth, ye serpents, and all deeps. Fire, hail, snow, ice, stormy wind; the things that perform his word. Mountains and all hills; fruitful trees and all cedars; wild beasts, and all cattle; reptiles, and winged birds; kings of the earth, and all people . . . let them praise the name of the Lord: for his name only is exalted.'

In 1.10 it has been mentioned that the idea of the reverential fear (*šfyt*) of the god is very common in Egyptian hymnography. Many deities can provoke this universal awe, but preference is always given to supreme-creator gods whose power is sufficient cause for the cosmic upheaval. For example, the hymn to Amun of papyrus Leiden I 350 tells us that ‘the mountains shake under him in the time of his rage, the earth quivers when he starts roaring, all beings are afraid because of the fearsomeness that he inspires’.²⁴⁶ It has to be noted that, generally, in Egyptian thought this ‘trembling with awe’ does not have any negative connotation in itself. On the contrary, it seems to be often associated with regeneration. Especially, if we consider that the Egyptians conceived the ‘end of the world’ as a state of immobilization, of cessation of movement (first of all, of the sun), it appears clear that the trembling and shaking of nature has to be interpreted as a manifestation of the life force of the god: everything that exists participates in this force, as divinity is considered as immanent – the god is inherent in the world.²⁴⁷

Egyptian parallels to our passage are to be found in the above-mentioned ‘*snḏ* exhortations’, common features of Ptolemaic temples whose *raison d’être* is exactly listing the different creatures and regions of the cosmos and exhorting them to ‘fear’ the god. In earlier hymns the hortatory structure is missing, but we can find some specific statements about the awed reactions of all creatures. For example, Amun: ‘all reptiles are joined to the ground from fear of your power’, ‘whose fear is great in every heart’.²⁴⁸ On the other hand, in the ‘*snḏ* exhortations’ the same idea is expanded in an incitement

²⁴⁶ V.12–14.

²⁴⁷ Traunecker 1992, 344–7 (also for some instances of ‘negative trembling’); Assmann 2001a, 68–73.

²⁴⁸ Leitz 1999, BM EA 10042 VIII.3–4; DMamm. 31, 9. Other examples in Rüter 2009, 132–8.

addressed by the king to the inhabitants of the four regions of the universe (sky, earth, Duat, water/Nun) in sequences of verses all starting with the imperative *snḏ*, ‘do fear’, followed by the name of a god, for example: ‘do fear Khnum, inhabitants of the sky ... do fear Khnum, inhabitants of the earth ... inhabitants of the Netherworld ... do fear Khnum mountains ... and you who are on the sea ... all living creatures ... deserts ... men and women ... animals of any kind ... birds ... fishes that live in the water ... reptiles that are in your dens ... and fields ... you who are at the threshold of the horizon (the dead) ... etc.’.²⁴⁹ After every caption, it is explained why the specified category should fear the god, that is (to simplify), because the god has a particular competence in that category. However, as all the possible categories are listed, the resultant idea is that the god rules over all the cosmos.

5–6 The combination of earthly, heavenly and marine creatures can also be used by Greek hymns to express the idea of ‘every possible animal’ (cf. **12.27–30**).²⁵⁰ In particular, the pairing of earthly and heavenly creatures, τὰ ἐρπετά and τὰ πτηνά, is very common in Judaeo-Christian literature,²⁵¹ but is found for example also in Isidorus’ *Hymn* 4: τοῦνεκα καὶ τῷ πάντα ἐπήκοα, ὅσσ’ ἐπὶ γαίῃ ἐρπετὰ καὶ πτηνῶν οὐρανίων τε γένη, ‘for this reason (i.e. the king in question was the son of Amun) all things heard (his voice), all things that move on earth and the races of winged heavenly creatures’.²⁵² Similarly, we find it in Egyptian hymns apart from ‘*snḏ* exhortations’:

²⁴⁹ Esna V 277.19–27, 355.1–8, 366.1–8, in Sauneron 1962b, 162–74. Also e.g. E VIII 153.3–154.16 in Kurth et al. 1998, 276–9; the *snḏ* exhortations at Koptos in Traunecker 1992, 142–9, no. 24, 212–20, no. 41, 365–70. All of them also in Rüter 2009, see especially 93–131.

²⁵⁰ *HH* 5.1–6, 30.1–5; *OH* 37.4–5, 78.10–11.

²⁵¹ E.g. LXX, *Ge. passim* (often with fishes and cattle), *Ho.* 4.3.3; NT, *Act.Ap.* 11.6.3.

²⁵² 27–8 (Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.*).

e.g. ‘praise to you (Geb) in the mouth of worms and insects, the ones that move on earth and the ones that fly’.²⁵³ For the sake of comparison with the Egyptian hymns quoted in the commentary to lines 1–8, it should now be remembered that ἐρπετά, apart from the general meaning of ‘animals’, ‘earthly creatures’, can also refer to ‘animals that creep’, ‘reptiles’. This translation is not so unlikely: considering that the subgroup ‘dolphins’ is used to refer to marine creatures in general, the subgroup ‘reptiles’ could be used to allude to a wider range of earthly creatures. At the same time, it is said that these animals will hear ‘the cry from their lairs’, and, unlike the ‘animals that creep’, not all earthly creatures necessarily have lairs.

9 Σημέα βασιλεῦ: It has been suggested that Semea derives from the Hebrew *shemesh*, ‘sun’, because of the appearance of σημεα on magical gems both in a sequence of seven *voces magicae* representing the secret names of the seven planetary deities (the so-called σημεα formula) and in connection with solar deities (the anguiped, see 1.8, and the Pantheos, see **Intro.** pp. 47–8, 1.11 pp. 77–8). Otherwise, it could be the name of the Syrian goddess Simea used as magical word.²⁵⁴


κόσμου [γενέτω]ρ: See 1.10.

ἔμοι ὕλαος ἔ[σσο: See 1.8

10–11 κάν[θαρε: The scarab had a strong symbolic value in Egyptian religion, where it represented the god of the rising sun Khepri, while it did not have any religious significance for the Greeks. This association between the scarab and the sun derives from observation of the dung beetle’s behaviour: it rolls

²⁵³ Koptos 32.2, in Traunecker 1992.

²⁵⁴ Bonner 1949, 271; Bonner 1950, 196–7, 246; Mastrocinque 2003, 110; for the formula in Jewish magical texts see Bohak 2008, 263–4; e.g. V 429; *PDM* xiv 214. For the goddess Simea see Ronzevalle 1934, especially 133–6; Brashear 1995, 3428 and glossary; or just for σημεῖα, ‘symbol’ (Ritner in Betz 1992, 207 no. 158).

a dung ball, which protects its egg, and eventually it buries it underground. The rolling ball was assimilated with the sun disc moving across the sky (see 5.5), and the emergence of the newborn scarab from the earth was thought to be a sort of self-generation. From the Old Kingdom onwards, the scarab god Khepri was considered to be both a solar deity with a special connection with the cyclic regeneration of the sun – with the sun at dawn – and a self-generated primordial god (the words *Hprī*, ‘Khepri’, *hpr*, ‘scarab’, *hpr*, ‘to become, to come into being’, all come from the same root and are all written with the trilateral sign  *hpr*).²⁵⁵ Owing to this symbolic value, the scarab/Khepri transcended his individuality and, as an image of the newborn sun at the beginning of time, became both a typical attribute of child solar gods (sun at dawn) and a manifestation of supreme-creator gods who have the ability to reunite in themselves all the different aspects of the sun (dawn, midday, sunset). For example, we find it as an epithet of Horus at Edfu, who can be the one who ‘shines as a child and rises to the sky as a scarab’;²⁵⁶ or of Amun, who can be called ‘Khepri . . . who raises his beauty on the body of Nut (the sky) and enlightens the Two Lands with his disc’, or ‘the great winged scarab within Nut, who protected heaven and earth in their entirety, while rising from Nun within the primeval mound’.²⁵⁷ The epithet is found also in the *PDM*, where for example the magician invokes the rising sun as ‘scarab’ or, identifying himself with supreme deities, he says ‘I am a scarab’.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁵ Minas-Nerpel 2006, especially 1, 61–3, 102–4, 140–3, 244–6, 306–8, 395–6, 463–77.

²⁵⁶ E.g. E I 25.10–12 in Kurth 1994, 90–1, text 3, scene 3; other examples in E *passim*, e.g. I 13.4–18 (Kurth 1994, 80–8, text 2).

²⁵⁷ Stele BM 826, 12; Hibis, Klotz 2006, II.5–7, also IV.32, III.39; for all the attestations see *LGG* V.718–19, *hpr*, ‘scarab’.

²⁵⁸ *PDM* xiv 652[XXI 25], 658[XXI 32]; Suppl. 65[6]; Suppl. 163[21]. Cf. Fauth 1995, 81–9.

10 χ]ρυσσοκόμην: See 2.2.

κλήζω... <σε>: See 1.20 (also at lines 13–14).

11 π]ᾱσι θεοῖσι καὶ [ἀνθρώ]ποις μέγα θα[ῦμα: The expression can be found in the *HH* to Demeter where Persephone rising from the realm of the dead in spring is said to be ‘a wonder for gods and mortal men’, μέγα θαῦμα θεοῖς θνητοῖς τ’ ἀνθρώποις.²⁵⁹ Our verse is likely to echo this passage since the *anodos* of Persephone and the subsequent regeneration of nature are comparable with the regeneration of the sun at every new dawn (‘scarab’).

13 δέσποτα ἀν[τολίης]: See 1.3.

Τιτάν: In Greek mythology, Helios, like other descendants of the six elder gods who ruled the world before the Olympians, can be called Titan as the son of the Titan Hyperion.²⁶⁰

πυρόεις ἀνατείλας: Another image that uses ‘fire’ as a metaphor for ‘light’, resembling some Egyptian epithets of Re, such as ‘3-*nbl-n-izbt-nt-pt*, ‘great of flame in the east of the sky’, ‘3-*nsr-n-m’ndt*, ‘great of flame in the morning boat’.²⁶¹

14–16 Διὸς ἄγγελον is already in Homer *Il.* 2.94, 24.169, but, given the context, it probably stands for θεοῦ ἄγγελον: for this and the other lines, see the parallel passage 1.5–6, 8.

14–23 On different divine entities conceived as forms of the same deity, see 1.5–10.

15 Ῥ[αφαήλ: Raphael, meaning ‘God has healed’, is the name of one of the hierarchically most important angels in Jewish religious tradition together with Michael and Gabriel (see 1.6–7).²⁶²

²⁵⁹ *HH* 2.403. Similarly, wonder takes hold of gods and men at the sight of Pandora in Hesiod’s *Theogony* (588–9), and Eros is a marvel for men and gods in Plato’s *Symposium* (178a.7–8); cf. Arat. *Phaen.* 15 (Zeus μέγα θαῦμα). See also Tissi 2013, *ad loc.*

²⁶⁰ E.g. Hes. *Th.* 371–4; Ezech. *Ἐξαγωγή* 217; Dorotheus Sidonius, fr. 3a.8, 3a.1, 2; Mesom. *GDRK* fr. 10.13; *OH* 8.2; 34.3 (Apollo), cf. Morand 2001, 159–61. On Titan as an ancient name of the solar god, Marót 1932, 195–200.

²⁶¹ *LGG* II.29, 33. ²⁶² Caquot 1971, 133, 140.

17 μέγιστε: Also at 21. Traditionally, common epithet of Zeus as king of the gods,²⁶³ later, used also especially for Sarapis,²⁶⁴ Hermes-Thoth²⁶⁵ and Helios.²⁶⁶

αἰθέριε: Sometimes found as an epithet of Zeus, lord of the sky,²⁶⁷ αἰθέριος here, owing to its proximity to μέγιστος, could echo Homer, *Il.* 2.412: Ζεῦ κύδιστε μέγιστε κελαινεφές αἰθέρι ναίων, 'Zeus, most glorious one, greatest one, wrapped in clouds, who dwell in the heaven'.²⁶⁸ On the other hand, Amun too was a sky god, mainly as god of the winds (see 2.1). The deity invoked in the hymn is a 'ruler of the sky' but also a solar god, and thus 'ethereal' could refer to the sun traversing the sky.

κλήζω ἀ[ρ]ωγόν σου: The helper, apparently Michael, could be the daimon whom the solar god has to send to prophesy.

Μ[ιχαήλ: See 1.6.

18 σῶζοντα βί . οσιδι . : MT suggest the reading σῶζοντα βίους ιδίων, 'you who save your people's lives'. Even without accepting it, the god is anyway described as σωτήρ, 'saviour', traditional attribute of various deities, especially Zeus,²⁶⁹ expressing their function as saviours in relation to humankind. In the *PGM*, σωτήρ and σῶζω are attested only twice in

²⁶³ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 3.276, 7.202; *HH* 23.4; Hes. *Th.* 548.

²⁶⁴ E.g. *Histor. Alex.* α 1.33.7; especially in inscriptions e.g. *SB* 1.169; *SEG* 18.699; *OGIS* 677.

²⁶⁵ E.g. *OGIS* 204, 206, 208; Roeder 1930, III *passim*; particularly in its form τρισμέγιστος, 'thrice-great', deriving from the Egyptian superlative *wr wr wr*, e.g. *Corp.Herm. passim*.

²⁶⁶ Especially in the *PGM* (e.g. IV 640, VII 529, XII 284, 301) and inscriptions e.g. *SEG* 18.618; *IGR* I.5.1184 (Zeus-Helios). On μέγιστος as divine epithet see Kazarow, *RE* 'Megas'.

²⁶⁷ E.g. Ps.-Aristot. *De mundo* 401a.17; *AP* 9.453.1.

²⁶⁸ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 4.166, *Od.* 15.523; cf. Hes. *Op.* 17; Theogn. *Eleg.* 1.757. Bernand 1969, 442 no. 114, II where the Iliadic verse appears in a dedicatory epigram from Akhmim.

²⁶⁹ E.g. Pind. *Ol.* 5.17; Aesch. *Supp.* 26; Aristoph. *Ec.* 79, *Pl.* 1189; Ael. Arist. *Eis Aia* 8.18. Also Apollo e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 512; Soph. *OT* 150; Sarapis e.g. P. Schubart 12.1; P. Berol. 10525.1; *SB* 1.169; *SEG* 18.699. Dornseiff, *RE* 'Σωτήρ'; Nock 1972c (also common title of Roman emperors); on the different uses of the title see Jung 2002, especially 45–72, 96–122, 169–72.

relation to a god, and it is always Helios: he is called ‘saviour’, and ‘rejoices in saving the ones who are his’.²⁷⁰ This association saviour-solar god is likely to derive from Egyptian tradition, since, from the Ramessid period onwards, Amun-Re developed his aspect of ‘ethical authority’, becoming the source of life not only for the cosmos but also for the individual, so that salvation or punishment depended on him. The god can be invoked with expressions such as ‘god is father and mother for him who takes him into his heart’, ‘the poor turn their faces to you, prisoners turn to you, the sick call upon you . . . to think of whom is good in times of distress, who rescues . . . everybody turns to you’, ‘who gives his hands to him who is in his bondage’, ‘who gives the breath (i.e. life) to anyone he loves’.²⁷¹

αι ... ὅμμα τέλ[ειον]: Preisendanz supplies τέλειον, while MT suggest the reading Διὸς ὅμμα τέλειον, ‘perfect eye of Zeus’, possibly inspired by Διὸς γαίόχον ὅμμα, ‘(Helios), eye of Zeus who protects the earth’, appearing in II 89 (hymn 7.14). However, while τέλειον is possible, the mention of Zeus seems very unlikely considering the letter traces still visible on the papyrus. Whatever the case, even without the mention of Zeus, the hymn seems to address the deity as ‘perfect, complete eye’. Hesiod mentions ‘the eye of Zeus that sees and understands everything’, πάντα ἰδὼν Διὸς ὀφθαλμός καὶ πάντα νοήσας;²⁷² the image clearly refers to the sun, as in other instances where ὅμμα or ὀφθαλμός ‘of the sky’ means ‘sun’ (or ‘moon’),²⁷³ exactly as in II 89 (7.14). The only exact parallel for the suggestion of MT, Διὸς ὅμμα τέλειον, appears in the

²⁷⁰ LXXXI 1, IV 1213. But found in Christian spells (Pr 1974, P 1.3, 9.2, 12.6) since σωτήρ was also a common epithet of God or Christ in Jewish or Christian literature respectively.

²⁷¹ These and more examples with references in Assmann 1995, 192–201; Assmann 2001a, 222–30.

²⁷² Hes. *Op.* 267 (cf. I n.40); also e.g. Cornut. 11.20; *Theosoph. Tubing.* 22.5; Nonn. *Dion.* 5.609, 7.190.

²⁷³ E.g. Aristoph. *Nu.* 285; Verdenius 1987–8, *ad* Pind. *Ol.* 3.20; Aesch. *Sept.* 390.

OH addressed to the Moirai,²⁷⁴ where the phrase is used to describe the ability of ‘observing everything from above’, i.e. omniscience, that Zeus shares with the Moirai. Therefore, τέλειος, ‘complete’, ‘entire’, could be understood in its specific meaning of ‘omnipotent’ (common epithet of Zeus), which could fit our hymn too. However, as the expression is attested only twice, the adjective τέλειος may find a better explanation in the light of the Egyptian religious tradition.

It seems that originally the ancient Egyptians thought of the sun and the moon as the right and left eyes of the sky god Horus the Elder. The various assimilations among different deities sharing similar functions caused some overlapping, and so the sun and the moon were frequently described as the eyes of other deities besides Horus: for example Re, or Ptah.²⁷⁵ In this context, the adjective τέλειος could refer to the well-known myth regarding the eye of Horus. In spite of the various versions of the story, the common outlines are easily traceable: the eye fled away or was separated from its owner; after a long search, the god Thoth found it and brought it back home, but before he could give it back to Horus he had to restore it, to ‘make it sound, whole’ (*swdʒ*, *km*) again, as it was damaged, broken into different parts. From this myth derives the symbol of the Udjat eye (*wḏʒt*), which is the ‘sound’ (*wḏʒ*), ‘complete’ (*km*), ‘perfect’ (*nfr*) eye of Horus.²⁷⁶ Though this myth should have originally been connected with the disappearance of the moon (eclipse or new moon), its different phases and its final stage of completeness (full moon), thus with the left eye of Horus, in other versions the protagonist of the story is the right eye, i.e. the sun.²⁷⁷

²⁷⁴ *OH* 59.13 (cf. Koops 1932, *ad* 8); cf. also Tissi 2013, *ad loc.*

²⁷⁵ Also in *PDM* xiv 658[XXI 33]: ‘eye of Pre’ ‘eye of Atum’. Cf. Boylan 1922, 68–70.

²⁷⁶ For the different qualities attributed to the eye of Horus, Nyord 2009, 193–201.

²⁷⁷ Otto, *LdÄ* ‘Augensagen’; Krauss 1997, 261–74. cf. Boylan 1922, 32–4, 70–1.

The ‘complete eye’ could thus correspond to the Udjat eye, and the phrase would serve as an epithet of the addressed supreme deity stressing his solar nature.

19 καὶ φύσιν ἀέξοντα καὶ ἐκ φύσεως φύσιν αἰῶθις: The papyrus reads διέξοντα, which Preisendanz emended to δείξαντα, ‘you who showed, revealed, made visible’. The correction ἀέξοντα (first suggested by Wünsch) seemed necessary for metrical reasons, and because the sentence had to be a zeugma, i.e. the verb had to govern not only the first clause but also the second: ‘you who developed (made to grow/exalted) nature in its turn from nature’ seems to make more sense than ‘you who showed (revealed) nature in its turn from nature’. But what would this mean? The verb ἀέξω (αὐξάνω) generally does not imply the idea of generating from nothing, but the idea of increasing something that already exists; otherwise, it can mean ‘to exalt’, ‘to glorify’. Thus, the phrase means either that ‘the solar god developed nature (but he did not create it) and, once developed, he keeps embodying the power that makes nature continuously regenerate from itself’, or that ‘the solar god both glorifies nature and develops nature’s self-regeneration’ – in both instances he would act as a nourisher. In any case, the meaning, especially of the second clause, remains quite obscure. Moreover, the word φύσις is repeated thrice in just one verse, which from the stylistic point of view recalls a rhetorical contrivance particularly appreciated in Egyptian poetry: creating alliteration using different forms of the same word, verb, or root.²⁷⁸ Taking this into consideration, the verse would resemble an expression we find very frequently in Egyptian hymnography in relation to creator or primordial gods: *hpr*²⁷⁹ *hprw nb m-ht hpr.f*, literally ‘who brought into existence everything that came into being after he came into being’;²⁸⁰ or its variant, *hpr n hpr hprw nb*, ‘who came into being when

²⁷⁸ See **Intro.** p. 45.

²⁷⁹ For this use of *hpr* see *Wb* III.264.17.

²⁸⁰ E.g. Aufrère 2000, 11b, 181b; cf. P. Bremner-Rhind XXVI.21: Faulkner 1933 (translation: Faulkner 1937b); P. Cairo 58032, 5–6.

anything that came into being had not come into being yet'.²⁸¹ The phrase is formed by different forms of the verb *hpr*, 'to come into being', 'to become', 'to grow' and its meaning is always the same. There are two stages of creation: first, the creator god came into being; and then he created all that exists. As noted by Bergman, the same concept with an almost identical expressive pattern is found at the beginning of the Gospel of John where the creative action of the Word/God is described: πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν, 'all things were made by it (him), and without it (him) was not anything made that was made'.²⁸² Coming back to our hymn, if we compare the Greek with the Egyptian, *hpr* could be rendered by φύσις if we consider it in its meaning of 'generation', 'creation', or, more precisely, as the noun derived from φύω. For this verb expresses a range of meanings almost identical to that of *hpr*: 'generate', 'bring to light', 'sprout', 'become', 'grow'. That is, φύσις is nothing but 'everything that was generated/brought to light', 'everything that came into being'. Nevertheless, if we try to translate the verse using 'creation' instead of 'nature' the sense does not change considerably.

However, a further comparison with Egyptian could suggest that the phrase might have been misunderstood by the first editors. For translating φύσις by 'nature' does not allow many possibilities: the preposition ἐκ must have the value 'from' and the lacuna at the end of the line could be integrated with α[ῦθις (as Preisendanz did following Eitrem's suggestion), or with α[ὑτήν, meaning 'who developed nature itself from nature' (as Fahz suggested). On the other hand, in the light of the Egyptian parallel, we could complete the lacuna with α[ὑτοῦ. The result would be: 'you who developed creation and (developed) creation starting from your own creation',

²⁸¹ E.g. D, Temple of Isis, in Porter and Moss 1960, VI.106–7; D I 41; P. Berlin 3049, XIII.5; Hibis, Klotz 2006, IV.12.

²⁸² NT, *Ev.Jo.* 1.3; Bergman 1982, 32.

which would be comparable both with the Egyptian expression and the Gospel of John. Moreover, in this hypothesis there is no need to replace δειξάντα with ἀέξοντα, because the meaning would not really change: ‘you who showed creation’, ‘you who made creation visible’. The use of the third person pronoun within an invocation in the second person might seem a problem, but αὐτός is sometimes used for the first/second person (LSJ I.10.b). At the same time, the Egyptian expression uses the third-person pronoun in that position, and thus a Greek rendering would have used the third person too: the phrase could have originated in a different context and been pasted in this section of the hymn. In fact, this passage is clearly a collage of various sources as shown by the immediately preceding section (lines 14–17) appearing also in 1.5–6, 8. A certain shift of addressee is already present at line 17 where the magician invokes ‘your helper Michael’, who, by the way, in theory could be the subject of the following two lines: ‘your helper Michael who both saves ... perfect eye ... and developed creation and (developed) creation starting from his own creation’. The phrase would be odd as we would expect the creative process to be ascribed to the supreme deity and not to his helper, but the impasse could be the result of the superimposition of different sources. In conclusion, the incongruities in meaning we find in the Greek verse could be eliminated by considering it as a translation of this common Egyptian sentence describing the creative dynamics of the solar god.

20, 26 σεσε[γγενβ]αρφαραγγης, ακραμμαχ[αρι: These magical names do not have a satisfactory explanation yet. They seem to appear in connection with solar deities.²⁸³

21 παντοκράτωρ: The term is almost exclusively attested within Judaeo-Christian literature, where it refers to God (the ‘Almighty’), starting from the Septuagint, in which it often

²⁸³ BG with extensive bibliography; Mastrocinque 2003, 100–1, 104; cf. Bonner 1950, 116, 154, 191, 201–2, in connection with the Pantheos, a scarab god and a lion-headed god.

translates the Hebrew **Σαβαώθ** (see line 22).²⁸⁴ Montevecchi noted that when the word is attested in connection with pagan deities (not before the first century BC), they are usually not Greek, such as Isis, as it expresses a conception unknown to Greek but typical of Semitic languages.²⁸⁵ In the *PGM* it occurs as an epithet of Typhon-Seth, Hermes, Agathos Daimon (described as a supreme deity with many traits comparable with those of Egyptian solar gods), Helios and unnamed solar deities, mainly in contexts not – at least apparently – influenced by Judaeo-Christian tradition.²⁸⁶ Thus, the epithet seems to be used indifferently, simply to state the supreme nature of the god. It has been mentioned how epithets such as **δέσποτα κόσμου** have an Egyptian conceptual equivalent in *nb r-dʿr*, ‘the lord of all’ (2.10). In this case, the equivalence is not only conceptual but also lexical.

22 νῦν λάμπων: The solar nature of the god is stressed again.

ἄναξ κόσμοιο: Variant of **δέσποτα κόσμου** see 1.1 and 2.10.

Σα[βαώθ]: From Hebrew, a name of God originally meaning ‘God of hosts (of Israel)’, then more generically ‘ruler of all the terrestrial and celestial powers’ (see line 21). Its frequent use in magic was probably promoted by its etymology *seba’ōth*, ‘seven letters’, referring to the seven vowels, in their turn referring to the seven planets.²⁸⁷

23 See 1.9.

24 κόσμος ἐὼν μόνος κόσμον ἀθανάτων ἐ[φορ]εύεις: This verse both clearly states that the god is a cosmic deity (see 1.11) and alludes to his solar all-seeing nature (see 1.9). The verb

²⁸⁴ Montevecchi 1957, especially 401–18. Cf. *OH* 18.17 (παντοκράτωρ epithet of Pluto); Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.2 (Bernand 1969, 631, no. 175, *ad loc.*) Isis is παντοκράτειρα as Nature and Persephone in *OH* 10.4, 29.10.

²⁸⁵ Montevecchi 1957, 410–11.

²⁸⁶ *IV* 272, 968, 1375, 1553, VII 668, 962, XII 72, 238 (=XIII 762), 250 (9.11), XIV 9, 17, XXIIa 19, LXXI 3, LXXVIII 13. Frequent in Christian spells, e.g. *Pr* 1974, *P* 1.1, 8a.1(rec.), 9.1, 12.13, 13a.1, 21.43, 45, 24.1.

²⁸⁷ BG; Perdrizet 1928, 79; Mastrocinque 2003, 104; cf. 3.33. Cf. also Bohak in *I* n.28.

ἐφορεῦω/ἐφοράω used for the divine sight from the above is attested since Homer and is typical of Helios: Ἡελίου δς πάντ' ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούει.²⁸⁸ Furthermore, the superiority of the god (μοῦνος) seems to be defined through comparison with other deities (ἀθανάτων), which excludes any underlying monotheistic conception.

25 αὐτομαθής, ἀδίδακτος: Saying of the god that he is the one 'who learnt by himself, untaught' is another way of expressing his primordially. The two adjectives are particularly appreciated in Judaeo-Christian literature where they can appear together and maintain this 'primeval' shade of meaning as qualities of God that men can possess only through divine will. For example, Philo, describing Adam's ability to give names to other living creatures, says he was αὐτομαθής and ἀδίδακτος,²⁸⁹ having been created directly by God.

μέσον κόσμον ἐλ[άυνων: In this context μέσον κόσμον possibly alludes to the zenith, or more precisely, to the point in which the sun is highest in the sky at midday (see 7.21).²⁹⁰ The use of the verb ἐλάυνω, 'to travel', to 'drive' (either by chariot or by boat), here as in 2.3C, implies once again that the god is identified with the physical sun.

27–8 Preisendanz supplies χαίρων (following Eitrem's suggestion), which would mean that the god 'is pleased by the laurel offerings and the doors of untamed Styx': a rather weird combination of pleasing things. Alternatively, MT's translation suggests that the two halves of the phrase should be considered

²⁸⁸ See I n.40.

²⁸⁹ Philo, *De op.* 148.3, *Legum* 1.92.5; cf. Philo, *De sacr.* 78.6, *De post.* 78.4; Euseb. *DE* 3.6.26. Ἀδίδακτος appears also in three oracles of Apollo Clarius describing the nature of god, Merkelbach and Stauber 1996 nos. 25.1, 26.14, 27.1 (see *Intro.* p. 34); cf. Tissi 2013, *ad loc.*

²⁹⁰ Cf. *Textus thesaur. min.* χ 10.7: δς ὥσπερ τόξον πυριφόρον μέσον κόσμον διαδραμών, 'the one who runs through the cosmos' midst as a fire-dart'; *OH* 19.1: πυραυγέα κόσμον ἐλαύνων, '(Zeus) you who guide/proceed through the fire-bright cosmos' (possibly referring to Zeus' lightning).

separately and that the god could be the one who ‘opens’ the doors of the Styx, which would fit the magical context. However, a conjectural participle ‘the one who opens’ cannot be restored either in the gap at line 27 – as it would have to govern the ‘laurel offerings’ too – or in line 28, owing to the presence of the second καί – unless we imagine that the god opens both the doors of the Styx and something else (e.g. πύλας καὶ ἄνοιγων), but what would it be? Another possibility, taking into account the following lines, would be to consider the laurel offerings, the doors and whatever else is missing as objects ‘by’ which the magician is adjuring the god (line 29, ὀρκίζω σε), exactly like ‘the god’s seal’ in line 29. In this interpretation the mention of the infernal river Styx would make better sense, as it would fit the Homeric tradition according to which the gods used to swear their most solemn oaths by the water of the Styx.²⁹¹ Apart from this, even if both the offerings of laurel (the sacred plant of Apollo) and the river Styx are specific to Greek mythology, the doors of the Styx are not otherwise attested, since as a river it is not supposed to have ‘doors’. We could imagine that πύλας is a mistake for πηγάς, ‘running waters’ (following the suggestion of Wunsch),²⁹² but, apart from the fact that πηγάς would be unmetrical, ‘the doors’ are in the text and the text must have made sense for its author and its readers, even if a mistake intervened at a certain stage. Now, considering that ‘the doors of Hades’ (instead of Styx) are often mentioned in Greek literature, either ‘Styx’ could be used as a metonymy for ‘Hades’,²⁹³ or some confusion could have occurred between Hades and Styx, as if ‘Styx’ were another name for ‘Hades’. However, if we assume that the author knew

²⁹¹ Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad* Hom. *Il.* 14.271; Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988, *ad* Hom. *Od.* 5.184–5; West 1966, *ad* Hes. *Th.* 400.

²⁹² *Pr* apparatus.

²⁹³ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.646, 8.16, *Od.* 14.156 (Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989, *ad loc.*); Aesch. *Ag.* 1291; Eur. *Hipp.* 57, 1447; cf. West 1966, *ad* Hes. *Th.* 741. Cf. also Tissi 2013, *ad loc.*, who interprets Styx as an ‘obvious metonymy for Hades’ but does not add any example.

the Homeric text well enough to refer to the adjuration by the Styx, such a confusion would be odd, since Homer always talks about the Στυγὸς ὕδωρ, the ‘water of the Styx’, which makes it hardly possible to confuse the river with Hades. An alternative solution may be found if we consider the Egyptian Netherworld: a great waterway was thought to flow through it, the waterway on which the solar god sailed during his night journey. During his course he had to pass through twelve doors, separating the twelve ‘divisions of the Netherworld’ and corresponding to the twelve hours of the night:²⁹⁴ within this Egyptian depiction, speaking of ‘the doors of a river’ would be perfectly sensible. Hence, the Egyptian image of the Netherworld waterway could have overlapped the Greek image of the Styx creating the otherwise unusual combination ‘doors of the Styx’.

29–31 ὀρκίζω σε, σφραγῖδ[α θ]ε[οῦ] ...: See 1.12. The statement that the sea restrains itself ‘when it hears’ indicates that the ‘seal of God’ must be something audible, which reinforces the hypothesis of interpreting it as ‘the name’ of God. Though the idea of a fearsome divinity (see lines 1–8 and 1.10) and of the power of the secret name of God is well known to be typical of Jewish religious thought, it is already attested in Egyptian tradition, which becomes especially interesting in so far as the mention of other gods (line 30) tends to exclude a monotheistic background. For example, of Amun it is said that ‘one would fall down immediately for fear, if his secret name is uttered intentionally or unintentionally, there is no god able to call him by it’, and ‘the Two Lands tremble at his great name’.²⁹⁵ These passages are also quoted by MT to demonstrate the Egyptian influence on another invocation in the *PGM* very similar to ours:²⁹⁶

²⁹⁴ Hornung 1963; Hornung 1991; Hegenbarth-Reichardt 2006, 100–81; Zeidler 1999, II; cf. Eaton 2013, 52–4.

²⁹⁵ P. Leiden I 350, IV.20–1; P. Cairo 58032, 12.

²⁹⁶ Appearing in XII 238–44 (immediately before 9), XIII 761–73 and possibly XXI 1–9; MT, I.127–222, especially 140–7 for the commentary. The text follows MT XII 238–44 including some integrations from XIII 761–73,

δεῦρό μοι, ὁ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων
 ἀνέμων, ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεός, ὁ
 ἐνφυσῆσας πνεύματα ἀνθρώποις εἰς
 ζωὴν, δέσποτα τῶν ἐν κόσμῳ καλῶν,
 ἐπάκουσόν μου, κύριε, οὐ ἔστιν τὸ
 κρυπτόν ὄνομα ἄρρητον, ὃ οἱ
 δαίμονες ἀκούσαντες πτοοῦνται, οὐ
 καὶ ὁ ἥλιος βαρβαρεῖχ (καὶ ἡ σελήνη)
 (αρσεμφεμφρωθου τὸ ὄνομα)
 ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰσι ἀκάματοι, λάμποντες
 ἐν ταῖς κόραις τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐ ἡ
 γῆ ἀκούσασα ἐλίσσεται, ὁ Ἄιδης
 ἀκούων ταρασσεται, (οὐ) ποταμοί,
 θάλασσα, λίμναι, πηγαὶ ἀκούουσαι
 πῆγυνται, αἱ πέτραι ἀκούσασαι
 ρήγυνται, καὶ οὐρανὸς μὲν κεφαλὴ,
 αἰθὴρ δὲ σῶμα, γῆ πόδες, τὸ δὲ περὶ
 σε ὕδωρ, ὠκεανός, Ἄγαθος Δαίμων, σὺ
 εἰ κύριος ὁ γεννῶν καὶ τρέφων καὶ
 αὐξῶν τὰ πάντα.

Come to me, you from the four
 winds, god ruler of all, who have
 breathed spirits into men for life,²⁹⁷
 master of the good things in the
 world. Hear me, lord, whose hidden
 name is ineffable.²⁹⁸ The daimons,
 hearing it, are terrified; the sun
 BARBAREICH and the moon
 (ARSEMPHEMPHRŌTHOU is the name)
 are your/its unwearied eyes,²⁹⁹ shining
 in the pupils of men. The earth,
 hearing it rolls over; Hades, hearing
 is shaken; rivers,
 sea, lakes, springs, hearing, are
 frozen; rocks, hearing it, are split.
 Heaven is you head, ether, body;
 earth, feet, and the water around
 you, ocean,³⁰⁰ O Agathos Daimon, you
 are the lord, the begetter, nourisher
 and increaser of all.³⁰¹

The appearance of the ‘terrifying name’ in a passage so strongly influenced by Egyptian conceptions³⁰² bolsters the hypothesis of a similar background for the verses in our hymn.

32 Here ‘Apollo’ seems to be used as a magical name and considered a separate deity.

33 αεγιουω: Alphabetical sequence of the seven vowels. Around the second century BC, Demetrius in his treatise *On Style* tells us that the Egyptian priests during the worship of the gods used to sing the seven vowels one by one,³⁰³ and their

and the translation is based on Betz 1992 with some adjustments. Assmann 1997a, 203–4 compares it with Egyptian hymnography; see also Koenig 2009, especially 317–20; Van den Broek 1978, 137–9. Cf. also Addey 2011, 290–2.

²⁹⁷ See 4.1, 3, 5.4.

²⁹⁸ See **Intro.** p. 46.

²⁹⁹ See 3.18.

³⁰⁰ See 1.11.

³⁰¹ See **Intro.** p. 46.

³⁰² For analysis of the Egyptian background see the commentary in MT and cf. here the single commentary sections listed in the preceeding footnotes.

³⁰³ Demetrius, *De elocut.* 71; for the date and authorship of this work see Innes 1995, 312–21.

frequency in magical texts and gems testifies to the great power they were thought to have, probably owing to the particular sonorous effect their various permutations could produce. They are often associated with the seven planets according to the Pythagorean theory that imagines the seven vowels as the seven tones generated by the movement of the seven planetary spheres.³⁰⁴ As here, they are often used as a ‘secret name’ of gods and find a further connection with Apollo thanks to the seven tones of the seven strings of the lyre – the Apollonian instrument.³⁰⁵

CONCLUSIONS

The structure of this hymn is even more distant from the Greek traditional pattern than that of 1 and 2. After the exhortative section (lines 1–8) what follows is mainly a sort of *epiclēsis* with hortatory addresses to the god – ‘be/come propitious’ (lines 9, 16), ‘shine now’ (line 22) – scattered throughout the passage. Even in this case, we cannot talk of a proper *pars epica* as the many participial – and few verbal (lines 21, 23–4) – phrases describe the god in his eternal – often cyclical – reality, leaving no space for narrative. The appearance of lines 14–16 and 23, paralleled in the section rich in Judaeo-Christian elements in 1.5–18, suggests that the hymn is a collage of different sources.

We saw that many constituents of the hymn can be ascribed to more than one religious background at the same time, or be the result of an overlap of different traditions (lines 1–8, 17 αἰθέριε, 18, 27–8, 29–32), while others have a more defined connotation (lines 10–11 κάνθαρε, 10 χρυσοκόμην, 13 Τιτάν, 21 παντοκράτωρ). However, when we try to summarize the

³⁰⁴ E.g. Nicomach. *Harm. enchirid.* 3; Brashear 1995, 343¹ with extensive bibliography; Dieterich 1891, 39–48; Dornseiff 1988, 12–14, 32–5, and especially 35–60, 81–3; Bonner 1950, 138, 186–7; MT, I.147–9.

³⁰⁵ Dornseiff 1988, 46.

CONCLUSIONS

nature of the deity invoked, he (and his name) inspires fear-someness to all the cosmos (including the Netherworld), he is a primordial creator, solar and ethereal at the same time, he helps humankind, rules over the cosmos and he 'is' the cosmos: these are attributes that, all together, have been shown to belong to the Egyptian theology of Amun-Re, and subsequently of other solar-creator gods.

HYMN 4

HYMN TO HELIOS: III 549–58 (EARLY FOURTH CENTURY)

This brief hymn appears in a spell entitled *σύστασις πρὸς Ἥλιον*, ‘encounter with Helios’ (III 494–611), a procedure suitable for ‘whatever you want’. The spell consists only of a long invocation: the magician adjures Helios (so that he may perform ‘the NN deed’ for him) listing the twelve different forms the god has in the twelve hours of the day; there follows the **hymnal section** enclosed by two long strings of *voces magicae*; after that, the invocation proceeds in prose asking for support, salvation, wealth, knowledge, good reputation, etc. (the final section has parallels in *Asclepius* 41, a treatise of the *Corpus Hermeticum* preserved only in Latin translation).

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: MT³⁰⁶ (Pr reconstructed hymn 2).

δεῦρό μοι ἐν | τῇ ἀγίᾳ σου περιστροφῇ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος· (550)
⟨δεῦρο σύ⟩, παν|τὸς κτίσ{κ}τα, θεῶν θεέ, κοίρανε ⟨παντός⟩,
πάν⟨τ⟩α διαστήσας | τὸν κόσμον {τῷ σεαυτοῦ} πνεύματι θε(ι)ῳ·
πρῶτος | δ’ ἐξεφάνης ἐκ πρωτογόνου φυνευμεδωδως |
5 ⟨ἐξ⟩ ὕδατος βιαίου ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας ἄβυσσον,
γαῖαν, | πῦρ, ὕδωρ ⟨τε καὶ⟩ ἀέρα καὶ πάλιν αἶθρα⟨ν⟩, (555)
καὶ ποταμὸν⟨ς⟩ κελλάδοντα⟨ς⟩· εἰσγηνονιδη δὲ σελήνη,
ἀστέρες ἀέριοι, | ἐῷοι, περιδινοπλανῆται,
αὐταῖς σαῖς βουλαῖς δορυφοροῦσιν ἅπαντα.

2–3 κυραννε πανοδιαστησας, P 5 βιου, P; βιό(τ)ου, MT;
κτισκτς, P 6 γεαν, P 7 καιλαδοντα, P; ὑσγηνοῖδῃ, Pr 8

³⁰⁶ II.1–33 with commentary.

COMMENTARY

αστερας αεριου εωσου περιουπλανηται, P 9 αυταισσεσ, P;
βουλαῖς <σοι> δο(υ)ρυ, Pr (hymns), MT

Translation

Come here to me in your sacred circuit of the sacred spirit;
come here, O founder of all, god of gods, lord of all,
you who divided the entire cosmos with your divine spirit;
you were the first who appeared from the primordial

PHYNEUMEDŌDŌS,

- 5 from the violent water, (you) the founder of all: abyss,
earth, fire, water and air, and ether in its turn,
and resonant rivers; EISGĒNONIDĒ the moon,
the heavenly stars, the morning stars and the planets that turn in
circles
attend everything by your very will.

COMMENTARY

1 δεῦρό μοι: With or without personal pronoun, this is another (see 1.7–9 ἵλαος ἔλθοις) typical invocational pattern of Greek hymns that urges the deity to appear at the celebration in his honour and was also largely adopted by magical hymns.³⁰⁷

1, 3 ἐν τῇ ἀγία σου περιστροφῇ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος / πάν(τ)α διαστήσας τὸν κόσμον {τῷ σεαυτοῦ} πνεύματι θε(ί)ῳ: The word πνεῦμα, whose first meaning is ‘breath of wind’, in both combinations ἅγιον πνεῦμα and πνεῦμα θεῖον can refer to the Spirit of God or the Holy Spirit in Jewish and Christian literature respectively,³⁰⁸ where it can be seen as the hypostasis through which God accomplishes the creation of the

³⁰⁷ Also in the form δεῦτε; e.g. Sappho, fr. 2.1, 53.1 (Lobel and Page); Hippon. fr. 3a.2 (West); *HH* 72.1; Furley and Bremer 2001, I.61, 4.1.1, 4.3.1 and commentary, 6.2.2, 6.6.11. Cf. 6.2–3 for similar patterns in Egyptian spells.

³⁰⁸ E.g. LXX, *Ps.* 51.11, *Od.* 14.15, *Sapient. Salom.* 1.5.1, *Is.* 63.10.1–11.2; NT, *Ev.Matt.* 1.18.3, 1.20.4, 3.11.4, *Ev.Luc.* 1.35.2, 2.26.2, *Ev.Jo.* 14.26.2.

cosmos.³⁰⁹ However, the ‘circuit’, ‘revolution’, of the sacred spirit and the ‘division’ of the cosmos through the spirit seem to echo the Gnostic conception that imagines the only true God, the Monad, the pure spirit, emanating from himself a series of other divine beings (Aeons) represented as concentric spheres in which the amount of πνεῦμα decreases in accordance with the increasing distance from their source, the Monad. After the auto-fecundation of one of these Aeons (Sophia) and the subsequent birth of the arrogant demiurge Yaldabaoth, the series of the spiritually decreasing emanations proceeds with the Archons until the creation of the material cosmos.³¹⁰ Similarly, in the *Corpus Hermeticum*, within a cosmogony of Egyptian flavour, the sky appears divided in seven circles, and the gods become visible as stars, and περιελίγη τὸ περικύκλιον ἀέρι, κυκλίῳ δρομήματι πνεύματι θεῖῳ ὀχούμενον, ‘the circle revolved around the air, moved by the divine spirit in its circular course’.³¹¹ Thus, the sacred circuit of the sacred spirit could allude to the furthestmost sphere encircling the world where the pure πνεῦμα abides, through which creation is achieved.

On the other hand, a concept very similar to the πνεῦμα and the idea of creation through ‘division’ are already present in Egyptian tradition. The first is embodied by the word *ḫw*, which, just like πνεῦμα, can mean both ‘wind’ and ‘breath’, especially ‘life breath’.³¹² The supreme deity, as a creator, gives off his breath identified with the wind,³¹³ in order to make all

³⁰⁹ E.g. LXX, *Ge.* 1.2, *Jb.* 26.13, *Ps.* 104.30.

³¹⁰ Sasse, *RAC* ‘Aion’, B; Brakke 2010, especially 53–62; cf. Colpe, *RAC* ‘Gnosis II (Gnosticismus)’.

³¹¹ *Hieros Logos* 3.2.9 (cf. Nock and Festugière 1945–54, I.42–3); cf. fr. 23.48.4 using ‘the nature of the divine spirit that encircles the world’ as a periphrasis for god. See Van den Broek 1996, 3–21.

³¹² It is not surprising if we consider the Egyptian climate. Cf. De Wit 1957, 35.

³¹³ Originally a task accomplished by the Heliopolitan Shu, the god of the air, who was afterwards considered as a ‘manifestation’ of Amun. Cf. 2.1.

the cosmos live: he is the one who ‘created the earth with the four winds . . . with the breath that came from his mouth’, ‘the wind comes out of his mouth to give life to all the nostrils’.³¹⁴ The idea of creation through division is best synthesized in an epithet typical of Amun-Re used to describe the creative process: *w'-ir-sw-m-hhw*, or *w'-ir.n.f-sw-m-hhw*, ‘the One who made himself into millions’.³¹⁵ Otherwise, the same idea is frequently found in the image of the creator god separating the earth from the sky (‘you have raised the heaven and kept earth down’),³¹⁶ or dividing the countries and their people (‘he separated the Two Lands . . . their outward appearances were distinguished from one another . . . he distinguished their tongues’),³¹⁷ and sometimes the verb *stn*, ‘to distinguish’, is used instead of ‘to create’ (‘god who distinguishes with his fingers’).³¹⁸ Even Isidorus calls Amun ζῶῆς ὁ μεριστής, ‘the one who divides life’, ‘the distributor of life’.³¹⁹

Furthermore, the first three lines of our hymn resemble the first lines of the *PGM* passage with strong Egyptian influences quoted in 3.29–31:³²⁰ ‘come to me, you from the four winds, god, ruler of all, who have breathed spirits (πνεύματα) into men for life’.³²¹ Similarly, in Egyptian hymnography Amun can be the one ‘who bends the winds, who traverses heaven every day, who lives as the Supports of Shu (god of the air)³²² unto

³¹⁴ P. Brooklyn 47.218.156 in Sauneron 1970, 2.1, 4.4; MT, I.140 for other Egyptian examples.

³¹⁵ *LGG* II.282, see also *ir-sw-m-hhw* I.489–90; Assmann 1995, 147–55 with discussion.

³¹⁶ ‘Tura hymn’, 13; also e.g. Hibis, Klotz 2006, II.30, IV.5, 15.

³¹⁷ Hibis, Klotz 2006, IV.17–18. ³¹⁸ P. Berlin 3055, XV.3, XVI.8.

³¹⁹ Isidorus, *Hym.* 4.25, Vanderlip 1972 *ad loc.*

³²⁰ Appearing in XII 238–44 (immediately before 9), XIII 761–73 and possibly XXI 1–9; MT, I.127–222.

³²¹ In both passages the god is asked to come from an aerial region, invoked with attributes stating his universal power, and addressed as the one who achieves creation through the πνεῦμα (of ‘all the cosmos’ or of the living creatures).

³²² The four pillars, each one at a cardinal point, used by the god Shu to keep the sky separated from the earth.

the limit of the heavenly circuit', 'it is in allowing throats to breathe that he spits out wind'.³²³ However, the *PGM* passage cannot be considered an exact parallel to our hymn – where especially ἅγιον πνεῦμα and πνεῦμα θεῖον underline a Judaeo-Christian³²⁴ (or Gnostic) influence – but it is useful to understand how, regardless of the source, lines 1–3 could have echoed Egyptian conceptions and thus been accepted in both religious traditions.

2, 5 παντὸς κτίσ{κ}τα / ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας / κοίρανε <παντός>: Παντὸς κτίστα recalls the previously discussed 'father of the cosmos' (see 1.10), but instead of the generative process it stresses the normative function. The earliest attestations of this specific combination come from the Judaeo-Christian milieu.³²⁵ In the *PGM* it appears as an epithet of Eros, as the 'founder of the universe', of Helios, in an invocation of strong Egyptian flavour, and, together with its variant κόσμου κτίστα, in another invocation addressed to Helios rich in Jewish/Gnostic elements.³²⁶ Furthermore, in XIII 62–4 the 'founder of all' is 'you, the self-engendered,³²⁷ who see all and are not seen,³²⁸ for you gave Helios (the sun) the glory and all the power, Selene (the moon) [the privilege] to wax and wane and have fixed courses³²⁹ ... for when you appeared, both the cosmos arose³³⁰ and light appeared;³³¹ all things are subject to you, whose true form none of the gods can see, who change

³²³ Hibis, Klotz 2006, II.24–5, I.6.

³²⁴ The Jewish God can 'give the breath' too, e.g. LXX, 2 *Ma.* 7.23; 'the creator of the world will give you breath/spirit and life again'; cf. *Corp. Herm.* fr. (Κόρη κόσμου) 23.14–17 (Nock and Festugière 1945–54, III.clxxxiv–clxxxv).

³²⁵ E.g. *Aristae Epistula* 16.2; LXX, 2 *Ma.* 1.24.3, 4 *Ma.* 11.5.1; Philo, *De spec.* 1.294.1 (τῶν ὅλων); Theophil. *Ad Autol.* 3.9.2; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6.16.146.2.3; Hippol. *Refut.* 8.19.2.4.

³²⁶ IV 1756, 1708, 1200 (followed by θεῖ θεῶν).

³²⁷ See 1.32 (*hpr ds:f*).

³²⁸ See *Intro.* p. 46 (for Amun as 'hidden' god) and 1.9.

³²⁹ See lines 5–9.

³³⁰ See 1.11.

³³¹ See 1.33.

into all forms, you are invisible,³³² Aion'.³³³ In spite of the name Aion, this passage shows a strong Egyptian influence as it contains attributes that are traceable to the theology of Amun, 'the hidden one',³³⁴ and remind us that an Egyptian equivalent of παντός κτίστα can be found in some typical epithets of Amun: *km3-ntt*, 'who creates everything that exists', or, more often, *ir-ht-nbt*, 'who creates everything', formed with the verb *ir*, which apart from a generic meaning 'to do' is used for the 'making' of concrete things such as the construction of buildings, resembling the κτίζω of our epithet.

Similarly, the second epithet – if we trust the supplement παντός – seems to be a variant of δέσποτα κόσμου or παντοκράτωρ (see 2.10, 3.21) even if much rarer and practically unattested in Judaeo-Christian literature.³³⁵ Alternatively, since the papyrus has κυραννε, it could be possible to read τύραννε instead of κοίρανε (see hymn 8.24).

Θεῶν Θεέ: This epithet is almost absent from Greek literary sources,³³⁶ since, as noted by Nock, even the use of the vocative Θεέ alone is somehow 'contrary to Greek linguistic feeling'.³³⁷ However, with reference to *it-itw*, 'father of fathers' (see 1.32), it has been noted that the repetition of the same word in this genitival pattern is very frequent in Egyptian epithets, which

³³² Cf. P. Leiden I.350, IV.17–18: 'One is Amun, who keeps himself concealed from them, who hides himself from the gods, no one knowing his nature . . . none of the gods knows his true form'; the typical epithets of Amun *w'-ir-sw-m-htw* (lines 1, 3), and *'3-htpw*, 'with many forms' (LGG II.220); Assmann 1995, especially 136–47.

³³³ See 1.15.

³³⁴ Betz 1992, 174 no. 16.

³³⁵ Cf. Hes. fr. 308.1 (Merkelbach and West); Ps.-Manetho, *Aptel.* 2.1 where the sun and the moon as astral bodies are said to be the lords (κυρανεόντες) of the cosmos in the air; *AP* 1.23.1; an exception among later authors is Synesius using the variant κοίρανε κόσμου thrice: *Hym.* 1.429, 481, 2.27. For κοίρανε κόσμου see also II 88 (7.13); *AP* 1.22.1, Appendix 1.154.1, 1.365.1.

³³⁶ Apart from the *PGM*; *Cyranides* 1.21.3; *Testam. Salom. C* 1.1–3, 8.6–7; *Histor. Alex.* e.g. γ 2.28.16.

³³⁷ Nock 1929, 233; Ritner 1995a, 3363.

suggests it could be a rendering of the Egyptian *ntr-ntrw*, ‘god of gods’, common epithet of supreme deities.³³⁸

4–5 Here is another passage that seems to refer to the Egyptian image of the solar-creator god emerging from the primordial ocean as sunlight (see 1.33). For example, in one of the Amun hymns of the Hibis temple the god is the one ‘who protected heaven and earth in their entirety, while rising from Nun within the primeval mound’.³³⁹ The connection between the coming into being of the deity and the shining of the sunlight is implied in the use of the verb *ἐκφαίνω*, which in the passive, apart from ‘to appear’, can also mean ‘to shine forth’.³⁴⁰ Moreover, the water’s description as *βίαιον*, ‘hostile’, ‘violent’, echoes the Egyptian expression *mw titi* (the water of fighting, of combat) used metaphorically for the destructive–regenerating aspect of the primeval water representing the state of chaos.³⁴¹ The same equation water–destruction–regeneration can be obtained by equating water with fire as for example in the image of the ‘Lake of fire’ in the Hermopolitan theology, which again represents the primeval water from which the sun god emerged in ‘the first time’.³⁴²

4. 7 φυνευμεδωδως, εισγηνονιδη: The two terms are probably corrupted readings rather than *voces magicae* (e.g. the first word seems to end with *ἐδωδός*, ‘given to eating’, and the second to start with *εἰς γῆν*, ‘into/towards the earth’), but no definite interpretation has yet been proposed. Preisendanz suggests *ύσγηνοιδῆ*, for *ύσγινοειδῆ*, ‘scarlet in appearance’, referring to the colour of the moon.

5–9 The god is the founder of all and moves the astral bodies with his will (cf. 9.12–14). In order to describe the range of the divine creation, a curious list of elements is provided.

³³⁸ *LGG* IV.431.

³³⁹ Hibis, Klotz 2006, II.5–7.

³⁴⁰ LSJ, II; cf. Isidorus, *Hym.* 4.8 (Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.*).

³⁴¹ Finnestad 1985, 42.

³⁴² Assmann 1969, 271–2; Hermesen 1995, especially 79–85; cf. Zivie-Coche 2009.

At first, we can recognize the standard four elements of nature (earth, fire, water, air) as originally postulated by Empedocles, with the addition of the fifth element ‘ether’ – constituting the regions above the terrestrial sphere – which was definitely established starting from Aristotle onwards.³⁴³ A very similar passage is found in the Orphic hymn to Zeus (see 1.11, 1 n.67) where the god is said to encircle ‘all things here, fire, water, earth and ether’. However, in addition we find the ‘abyss’ and the ‘resonant rivers’.³⁴⁴ In 1.33 it has been discussed how ἄβυσσος in the *PGM* can refer to the Netherworld or to a body of water sometimes identified with the Egyptian primordial ocean Nun. Whichever meaning we choose, abyss and rivers are not enough to represent the regions of the cosmos, thus it is not clear why they have been added to a list of the elements of nature created by the god. The mention of rivers alone – without ‘sea’ – could suggest an Egyptian setting: for example, in Isidorus’ *Hymn* 2, Sokonopis – a Fayumic form of the crocodile god Sobek – is called the ‘founder (κτίστης) of the earth and the starry sky and all the rivers and very swift streams’.³⁴⁵ Furthermore, the puzzling presence of the ‘abyss’ could be justified considering the phrase as the result of a superimposition of the traditional Greek elements of nature upon the traditional Egyptian list of ‘things’ that the supreme god created or governs, which can include, following the standard subdivision, both regions of the cosmos and elements of nature: e.g. *ir-pt-t3-dw3t-mw-dww*, ‘who creates the sky, the earth, the Netherworld, the water and the mountains’, *nb-pt-t3-dw3t-t3w-mw-Nwn-h3swt*, ‘lord of the sky, the earth, the Netherworld, the air, the water

³⁴³ E.g. Plato, *Ti.* 58d, *Cra.* 408d, *Epin.* 981c; Aristot. *Cael.* 269b13-17, 270b21-2, *Ph.* 212b20-2, *Mete.* 339a11-32, 339b16-27; Plu. *De E* 390a3. Solmsen 1957, 119. Cf. *Corp.Herm. Poimand.* 17.3 (where αἰθήρ is used for ‘air’ and πνεῦμα for ‘ether’), fr. 24.1.5-13 describing four regions of the universe: the sky, the ether, the air and the earth. Cf. Dieterich 1891, 56-62.

³⁴⁴ For ποταμούς κελάδοντας cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.576.

³⁴⁵ Isidorus, *Hym.* 2.11-12 in Vanderlip 1972.

the Nun and the foreign lands'.³⁴⁶ An interesting comparison with our hymn is offered by the Brooklyn magical papyrus mentioned above (**Intro.** pp. 49–50, **I.11** pp. 77–8) where the Pantheos is 'the great eldest god of the primordial time (cf. line 4), ruler of rivers (and not sea), king of the gods (cf. line 2, $\theta\epsilon\omega\upsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}$), lord of the sky, the earth, the Netherworld, the water and the mountains'.³⁴⁷

The second section of the passage deals with the astral bodies moved by the god's will. Apart from the moon, there are the morning stars, the 'stars that wander' – i.e. planets – and the $\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\epsilon\rho\iota\omicron\iota$, which should correspond to the fixed stars even if the usual terminology would be $\acute{\alpha}\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, 'that do not wander'. The verb $\delta\omicron\rho\upsilon\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, 'to attend as a guard', 'to accompany', can be used for the morning and evening stars escorting the sun or the moon respectively,³⁴⁸ but here the extended expression 'attend everything' seems to refer generically to the movements of the astral bodies which 'attend' all the cosmos. For example, in the Hermetic treatise *Though Unmanifest God is Most Manifest*, the solar god, 'the greatest god among the heavenly gods', is said to be the one who established and maintains the order of the astral courses.³⁴⁹ On the other hand, this relation between the god and the stars is already found in Egyptian tradition, where Amun-Re can be *nsw-n-pt-ir-sbzw.s*, 'king of the sky who creates its stars', or Re can be *wd-sbzw.f*, 'the one who orders his stars'; Thoth can be *ir-n't-sbzw*, 'the one who causes the courses of the stars'; again of Amun-Re it is said that 'just as he assembled the heavens entirely, so did he direct the stars at his side while making judgment', 'just as the storms have their days, so are the stars upon their circuits, through the decree of this noble god', and Montu 'guides the living-stars: the stellar messengers do what

³⁴⁶ *LGG* I.455, III.628.

³⁴⁷ Sauneron 1970, 4-3.

³⁴⁸ E.g. Serapion, *CCAG* fr. 8.4.227.8–10; Ptolem. *Apotel.* 3.5.2.7; Hephaest. *Apotel.* 97.22.

³⁴⁹ *Πρὸς Τὰτ πλόν* 5.3–4 (Nock and Festugière 1945–54, *ad loc.*).

CONCLUSIONS

comes out of his mouth'.³⁵⁰ Moreover, the traditional Egyptian terminology separates the *i.hmw-sk*, 'imperishable', from the *i.hmw-wrđ*, 'the indefatigable', i.e. the circumpolar (that never set under the horizon and apparently do not move) and not-circumpolar stars including the planets; thus Osiris can be *hry-tp-i.hmw-sk*, 'chief of the imperishable', and *nsw-bity-i.hmw-wrđ*, 'king of the indefatigable', and Amun-Re-Harakte can sail with 'his crew of indefatigable and imperishable stars'.³⁵¹

CONCLUSIONS

The hymn opens with the magician's request followed by a brief series of epithets (lines 1–3) rich in Judaeo-Christian vocabulary, but the rest of the composition resembles more a *eulogia* than an *epiclēsis*, since the aorist passive ἐξεφάνης (line 4), expressing the perfective aspect, together with the presence of only one participial phrase and one substantival participle, gives the account a strong narrative shade.

Beyond this novelty in style, the description of the god is less detailed compared with the previous hymns (for example, no mention is made of his cosmic nature, or of the power he exerts over the Underworld, but cf. 5–9), and a strong Gnostic background would seem to underlie lines 1 and 3. However, even if not openly stated, the hymn itself – apart from the surrounding spell – implies that the deity is solar since the sun is not listed among the astral bodies moving according to the divine will, and this would not fit with Gnostic conceptions. Furthermore, the Gnostic God who divided the cosmos through the πνεῦμα could not be the same as the one who created the material

³⁵⁰ LGG IV.328 (*nsw-n-pt-ir-sb3w.s*), II.635 (*wđ-sb3w.f*), I.461 (*ir-n't-sb3w*); Hibis, Klotz 2006, IV.5, 29 and p. 141; Medamud hymn, 38; Morenz 1973, 167.

³⁵¹ LGG V.398, IV.326; P. Berlin 3050, I.2–4; see Krauss 1997, 86–126; Chatley 1941, 125–6; on the Egyptian knowledge of the morning stars, Parker 1974, 60; cf. Conman 2003, especially 37–9 questioning the standard interpretation of the 'imperishable', though not particularly convincing.

HYMN 4

world (lines 1, 3) – symbolized here, apart from the elements of nature, by the ‘resonant rivers’ – or the one who ‘appeared from the violent water’. At the same time, the creation of the cosmos through the *πνεῦμα* and the coming into being of the god from the water would not fit Helios nor Apollo.

We saw how all the verses can have an Egyptian interpretation too, apart from the cases in which the Egyptian background seems the only possible one (lines 2 *θεῶν θεέ*, 4–5). As always in these hymns, this does not mean that all the single constituents had to have an Egyptian origin or to be translations from the Egyptian, but that, whatever their original sources, they could be accepted within an Egyptian-influenced conception of the divinity and reinterpreted as befitting the Egyptian solar-creator god. Even in this hymn, the Egyptian background is the only one that can give coherence to all the various divine attributes.

HYMN 5

HYMN TO HORUS HARPOCRATES: IV 939–48 (FOURTH CENTURY)

This hymn appears in a complex spell (IV 930–1114) entitled αὐτοπτος (‘seen in person’), which seems to be the Greek equivalent of the Demotic *ph-ntr*, ‘god’s arrival’: a divine entity is supposed to appear to the magician either in the flesh or in a dream.³⁵²

- Preliminaries: The magician has to wear a ‘prophetic garment’, an olive-tree wreath and a special pebble.
- Invocation: After the brief **hymnal section**, the magician asks the god to reveal to him whatever he wants to know.
- Further invocations: The magician has to recite five other invocations in front of a lamp: an invocation to the deity so that he may appear in the light of the lamp; a formula to prevent the light of the lamp from fading; a long prosaic invocation asking the god to appear as the magician utters his secret names and identifies himself with other divine entities; a charm of compulsion which will force the god to come in case he delays; and a greeting formula to be recited after the god’s arrival. After greeting him, the magician has to tread with his left heel upon the big toe of the god’s right foot in order to prevent him from going away.³⁵³
- Release: After disposing of the wreath and the pebble, the magician raises his foot from the god’s toe while reciting two

³⁵² Johnson 1977, 90–1; Dieleman 2011, 108–9. Originally used for oracular consultation of a divine statue, cf. Ritner 1993, 214–15.

³⁵³ On trampling underfoot as annihilation of enemies, Ritner 1993, 119–36. Cf. P. Bremner-Rhind, XXIII.5, 12, XXVI.4, XXVIII.16: Faulkner 1933 (translation: Faulkner 1937b).

brief formulae: one for the dismissal of the god, and the other for the dismissal of the light.

- Protective charm: A magical formula has to be written on a linen strip (taken from a marble statue of Harpocrates) to be worn around the neck for protection during the rite.
- Notes: This final section gives instructions on how to prepare both the room in which the rite will take place and the lamp used in the procedure. Moreover, it describes the phases through which the god's apparition will take place in the lamp.

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: MT (Pr reconstructed hymn 3).³⁵⁴

χαῖρε δράκων, ἀκμαῖε δὲ λέων, φυσικαὶ πυρὸς ἀρχαί,
χαῖρε δὲ λευκὸν ὕδωρ καὶ δένδρεον ὑψιπέτηλον, (940)

καὶ χρυσοῦ κυαμῶνος ἀναθρόσκων μελίλωτον,
καὶ καθαρῶν στομάτων ἀφρὸν ἥμερον ἐξαναβλύων,
5 κάνθαρε, κύκλον ἄγων σπορίμου πυρός, αὐτογένεθλε,
ὅτι δισύλλαβος εἶ, ΑΗ, καὶ πρωτοφανῆς εἶ·
νεῦσον ἐμοί, λίτομαι, ὅτι σύμβολα μυστικὰ φράζω· (945)

ἠωαίου ἀμερρ οὐσωθ ιυῖωη μαρμα-
ραυωθ λαῖλαμ σουμαρτα·
10 ἴλαθί μοι, προπάτωρ, καί μοι σθένος αὐτὸς ὀπάζοις.

1 αρχη, P 2 Cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.458: γίνετο δ' ὕγρὸν ὕδωρ καὶ
δένδρεον ὑψιπέτηλον 3 αναθροῖσκων, P 4 ἐξαναβλύζων,
Pr, MT; I cannot see the ζ on the papyrus, and thus I prefer the
reading ἐξαναβλύων, equivalent in meaning to ἐξαναβλύζων 6
ὅστε δισύλλαβος, MT

Translation

Hail serpent, lion at the full height of its strength, natural origins of fire,
hail clear water and lofty foliated tree

³⁵⁴ MT, I.2–10; Fauth 1995, 108–9.

COMMENTARY

- and you who sprout from the golden field of beans as clover (sweet lotus)
and you who make mild foam gush forth from pure mouths,
5 scarab, who lead the circle of the fertile fire, self-engendered,
as you are two-syllabled, AĒ, and the first who appeared:
nod to me, I beg, because I declare your mystic symbols
ĒŌAIOYAMERROOUŌTHIYIŌĒ MARMA-
RAUŌTH LAILAM SOUMARTA.
10 Be propitious to me, first father, and may you yourself grant me strength.

COMMENTARY

1 χαῖρε: Traditionally, a concluding formula of a hymn rather than an opening.³⁵⁵ The verb χαίρω and its derivatives are typical of Greek hymns since they convey the fundamental concept of χάρις: a word that expresses both the ‘attitude of grateful adoration which ideally characterizes the worshipper’, and ‘the god’s grace and favour gained by that adoration’.³⁵⁶

δράκων, ἀκμαῖε δὲ λέων: In Greek tradition, the serpent and the lion are practically irrelevant as epithets of a god, as they normally play a role only in the iconography of monstrous composite figures such as the Sphinx or Chimera. Exceptions could be found in Dionysus’ ability to change into a lion, or in Orphic literature, where both Dionysus and Zeus can turn into serpents and Phanes-Protogonus can have the body of a winged serpent with three heads: bull, human, lion.³⁵⁷ Moreover, the god Aion in his late iconography can have the head of a lion

³⁵⁵ E.g. *HH* 4.579 (Vergados 2013, *ad loc.*), 5.292, 7.58; Callim. *Hym.* 2.113 (Williams 1978, *ad loc.*); Maiistas, 64 (Engelmann 1975, 56, line 93).

³⁵⁶ Furley and Bremer 2001, I.61–3, and see the index for many examples; see *Intro.* p. 30; cf. also **1.8**, **3.16**, **6.1**, **7.13**, **31**, **8.27**, **11.1–2**, **12.34**, **15.44**. See also Burkert 1994, 14.

³⁵⁷ E.g. *HH* 7.44–7; Nonn. *Dion.* 5.562–72, 6.155–62; see **I** n.68. Cf. also the serpent regenerating himself at the end of Hesiod, *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 204.124–39, West and Merkelbach); see Strauss Clay 2005, 32–4. On the snake and the lion in the iconography of monstrous figures see Strauss Clay 1993.

and a snake curling around his body (1.15). However, neither of these examples mentions a scarab (here at line 5), nor does anything in our hymn suggest that we are dealing with the description of a metamorphosis process or of a composite divine body.

On the other hand, in Egyptian tradition, the serpent and the lion belong to that category of dangerous animals characterized by an ambivalent symbolism. They both can be lethal, and the snake's bite is so much feared that the serpent embodies the enemy of the sun god *par excellence*, Apophis.³⁵⁸ At the same time, their killing power can be used by the gods and the Pharaoh to their own advantage in order to fight negative forces.³⁵⁹ For this reason the serpent ends up on the forehead of solar gods and kings in the form of the uraeus snake, spitting fire from its mouth, which expresses the defensive-destructive power of the sovereigns. At the same time, the lion, in its positive role of protector warrior, is strongly related to kingship and to the solar aspect: it can represent the sun at the horizon and the sun at midday, and can be used to describe solar-creator gods,³⁶⁰ while lioness goddesses such as Sekhmet and Tefnut are often identified with the 'eye of Re', in its turn identified with the solar uraeus.³⁶¹

³⁵⁸ The giant serpent embodying the principle of chaos, which every night threatens the sun's journey through the Underworld: Hornung and Badawy, *LdÄ* 'Apophis'.

³⁵⁹ See Ritner 1993, 128 footnote 583. The natural association between the dangerous animals and the liminal areas of the desert not only reinforces their apotropaic aspect, but also makes them particularly apt to repel the external enemies of Egypt.

³⁶⁰ For Amun in the form of a lion, Horus (and Harakhte) leontocephalos, e.g. Piankoff 1933, 176–7; on the lion and polymorphic deities see Michel 2002, 16–25.

³⁶¹ Martin, *LdÄ* 'Uräus'. The identification of the lioness goddesses with the uraeus snake underlines the connection between the two animals based on the attacking-protective role they share and on their subsequent solar connotations: the serpent and the lion appear together also as two of the many animal components in the iconography of polymorphic deities (see **Intro.** pp. 48–9, 1.11 pp. 77–8, and below). On the lion in Egypt, De Wit 1951.

Moreover, the serpent is associated with the chthonic world and – owing to its physical appearance and biological characteristics (sloughing) – with the principles of indistinctness and regeneration, which makes it one of the preferred symbols of primordial status. The lion can have some primordial connotations too: it is associated with solar deities, who are often primordial; or it can be used in the iconography of some primeval gods owing to their kinship with other lion deities. For example, Nefertem, the god of the primordial lotus (see line 3) which emerged from the primeval ocean at the beginning of time, can appear in lion form as the son of the lioness Sekhmet.³⁶²

We can recognize both the solar and primordial aspects in the deities that bear the epithet ‘serpent’ or ‘lion’, or that are represented as such.³⁶³ For example, Harsomtut (a form of Horus, *Hr-sm3-t3wy*, ‘Horus who unifies the Two Lands’) at Dendera is ‘the great serpent who came from the lotus’, identified with the creator deity *s3-t3*, the ‘son of the earth’, who has the shape of a serpent.³⁶⁴ Atum, the primordial god of Heliopolis, is represented before the creation as a serpent swimming in the Nun, the primordial ocean, and at the end of time he will become a serpent again.³⁶⁵ In the Brooklyn magical papyrus often mentioned above, two illustrations depict a snake with human legs and arms holding a disc in which the

³⁶² E.g. Davies 1953, sanctuary A, north wall, plate 3, IV register, 18, 21; Malaise 1990, 713. Still in *PDM* xiv 300 [X 27], 809 [XXVII 5], where the solar god can be invoked with ‘hail lion, like a lion of the primeval waters’.

³⁶³ Since the addressee of the hymn is male, the discussion concerns mainly male deities.

³⁶⁴ Eg. D II 164.4, III 115.6, III 190.18, cf. II 164.9, III 116.8, IV 53.10; for the lotus see line 3.

³⁶⁵ *BoD* 175. Like the ouroboros, symbolizing cyclical eternity (see I n.96). Cf. the initial creator *Km-3t.f* in the form of a serpent, creating a second serpent in the cosmogonical inscriptions of the temple of Khonsu at Karnak in Mendel 2003, 64–72.

child solar god appears: the caption says it is ‘Atum, lord of Heliopolis’.³⁶⁶

On the other hand, Ptah and Amun can be ‘lions’,³⁶⁷ and the epithet is almost always accompanied by an adjective expressing the fierceness or vigour – such as like ἀκμαῖος – of the animal, usually *wr-phṯy*/‘3-*phṯy*. For example, Atum, Sobek, Horus and again Amun can be ‘lions of great strength’.³⁶⁸ In the Invocation hymn of the temple of Hibis Amun is the ‘lion . . . who lives as a scarab beetle’ (line 5 κάνθαρε);³⁶⁹ at Dendera Horus is ‘the lion full of life’ (*m3i-ḥḥ*), and at Edfu he is ‘the lion . . . self-engendered’ (line 5 αὐτογένεθος).³⁷⁰ The iconographic tendency to represent solar gods with the appearance of a lion increases especially from the Late period. One of the best examples for the Graeco-Roman period is the polymorphic sphinx god Tutu (Tithoes).³⁷¹ Similarly, the complex image of Bes-Pantheos develops around the body (or the head) of the dwarf god Bes, whose earlier iconography seems to have included leonine traits.³⁷² Coming back to our hymn, the god invoked is certainly part of the same category as the deities mentioned above since he is solar (references to ‘the fire’, epithets ‘lion’ and ‘scarab’) and primordial (‘self-engendered’, ‘the first who appeared’ and ‘first father’).

³⁶⁶ Sauneron 1970, fig. 2, 3. Cf. e.g. the serpentine form of the primordial creators Geb and *Ir-t3*, ‘the creator of the earth’, e.g. Traunecker 1992, 99 (11.1), 149–50 (25.1).

³⁶⁷ E.g. P. Berlin 3048, VIII.8; Hibis, Klotz 2006, I.10, III.26. *LGG* III.207–8 (*m3i*).

³⁶⁸ E.g. P. Ramesseum 6, 32; E IV 106.15, 107.7–11, 108.2–5, 130.4–7 in Kurth 1994, 151–3 text 23, and De Wit 1954, with more examples; *LGG* III.209 (*m3i-phṯy*, ‘strong lion’), for *wr-phṯy* and ‘3-*phṯy*, cf. II.437–9, 22–5. Cf. Dieterich 1891, 52.

³⁶⁹ Hibis, Klotz 2006, I.10–13.

³⁷⁰ E.g. D I 142.8; E I 30.13–14 in Alliot 1949, 86; cf. *LGG* III.208–9 (*m3i-ḥḥ*). Cf. Fauth 1995, 59–60.

³⁷¹ See **Intro.** p. 49; also Michel 2002, 16–25. On the lion in connection with the representation of polymorphic deities see Quack, in press.

³⁷² See **Intro.** p. 48.

φυσικαὶ πυρὸς ἀρχαί: In Greek tradition this epithet could allude to Zeus *πυρφόρος*, originating the fire through his lightning (see 2.23A). Otherwise, it could echo any philosophical/religious conception of the elements as emanating/created from/by a superior principle, but the single mention of ‘fire’ would be at least curious – unless we imagined a reference to the Stoic fire-logos first principle of the universe.³⁷³ More likely, ‘fire’ is used again as a metaphor for the light of the sun. As already seen, in the Egyptian tradition an image like this would fit the other attributes analysed since it would refer to the solar god appearing for the first time at the beginning of creation (see 1.33). Furthermore, the element ‘fire’ had strong connections both with the serpent (fire-spitting uraeus) and with the lion (lion goddesses identified with the uraeus).³⁷⁴ Thus, saying of a god who is called ‘serpent’ and ‘lion’ that he is also the ‘natural origins of fire’ does not seem particularly surprising within this context.³⁷⁵

2 As shown in the apparatus, this verse is an adaptation of Homer *Odyssey* 4.458. In its original context it appears within the episode of Menelaus trying to obtain an oracle from Proteus while being restrained by hostile winds on the island of Pharos. When Menelaus and his companions succeed in capturing the god, Proteus assumes different shapes in order to try to escape:

ἀλλ’ ἦ τοι πρόωιστα λέων γένετ’ ἠϋγένειος,
αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα δράκων καὶ πάρδαλις ἠδὲ μέγας σῦς·
γίνετο δ’ ὕγρον ὕδωρ καὶ δένδρεον ὑψιπέτηλον.

but also at first he turned into a well-maned lion,
and then into a serpent, and a leopard, and a huge boar;
then he turned into running water, and into a lofty-foliaged tree

³⁷³ See **I** n.192.

³⁷⁴ See above.

³⁷⁵ Cf. the images of lion deities with the hieroglyphic sign of ‘fire’ on the head (apotropaic in function) found e.g. on magical healing statues, e.g. Kákosy 1999, 88 (VIII.4–5, IX.3), 143 (III); also the role of the fire in the iconography of the Pantheos (see **Intro.** p. 48, 1.11 pp. 77–8).

In MT, great importance is given to the similarities between this Homeric passage and the magical hymn: despite their understanding of the strongly Egyptian connotations of the hymn, the authors suggest that we are dealing with a hymn to Proteus in which the god is addressed with attributes typical of the Egyptian solar deities since Greek tradition considered Egypt as his birthplace or residence.³⁷⁶ However, the only real point of contact between the two texts is the mention of the lion and the serpent as shapes of the god (neither the leopard nor the boar are present in our hymn). Moreover, in the Homeric passage the verb γίγνομαι underscores that the different shapes are nothing but metamorphoses of Proteus. On the contrary, in the magical hymn the god is simply addressed as 'lion', 'serpent', without anything else that could suggest a transformation process: the shapes are symbolic and are used to describe different aspects of the nature of the god. The deity described by our hymn is solar and primordial and, while we sometimes find Proteus described as a primordial deity (owing to the etymology of his name),³⁷⁷ there is nothing to suggest he could be considered a solar god.³⁷⁸ Therefore, even if the author of the hymn must have known the Homeric passage, it seems improbable that he, wanting to write a hymn to Proteus, decided to omit the leopard and the boar and to add various attributes typical of Egyptian solar deities. More probably, he was writing a hymn to a solar god and chose to insert that specific Homeric verse as the context (the appearance of the lion and the snake) echoed the common Egyptian images he was using.

³⁷⁶ On 'Egyptian' Proteus e.g. Hom. *Od.* 4.355, 384–5 (Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988, *ad loc.*); Posidipp. *Epigr.* 115 (Austin and Bastianini); Herter, *RE* 'Proteus' especially III, IV.1–2; O'Nolan 1960. In general on the contacts between Greek and Egyptian mythology see Rutherford 2011.

³⁷⁷ Cf. *OH* 25 where Πρωτεύς is πρωτογενής and original cause of the cosmos; similarly, in the allegoric interpretation of Proteus in Heraclit. *Quaest. Hom.* 65.4.

³⁷⁸ Even the deity addressed in the prosaic section of the spell has nothing that could characterize him as the Greek sea god.

3 καὶ χρυσοῦ κυαμῶνος ἀναθρόσκων μελίλωτον: At first sight this phrase appears rather obscure, as it is not immediately clear why the solar god should be described as ‘clover’ sprouting from a field of beans. As there is no reasonable explanation for an image like this and there are no reading problems in the papyrus, the only possible solution is to widen the semantic range of the terms *κυαμών* and *μελίλωτος* in order to find a more sensible meaning. The plant generally referred to as *μελίλωτος*, ‘melilot’ or ‘sweet clover’ (*Trigonella graeca*),³⁷⁹ is a kind of clover in the genus *Trifolieae* belonging to the *Fabaceae* family (i.e. *Leguminosae* or pulses). At the same time, the term is a compound from *μέλι*, ‘honey’, and *λωτός*, which can be used for different plants and trees: among others, the clover, but also the Egyptian lotus.³⁸⁰ Moreover, *κύαμος* apart from meaning ‘bean’ (*Vicia Faba*) can also refer to the *Nelumbo nucifera*, i.e. the so-called Indian lotus, a plant that though resembling the traditional Egyptian water lilies (*Nymphaea caerulea* and *Nymphaea lotus*) belongs to a different family (*Nelumbonaceae*, not *Nymphaeaceae*) and was probably introduced in Egypt during the first Persian occupation (525 BC).³⁸¹ The *Nelumbo nucifera* is well attested in the Hellenistic period, and in Greek was called ‘Egyptian bean’ (*Αἰγύπτιος κύαμος*)³⁸² because of the shape of its seeds. Summarizing, we find here a plant of the pulse family whose name is compounded with *λωτός*, which sprouts from a field of beans/Egyptian-lotus-looking plants. Thus, *μελίλωτος* must refer to the Egyptian lotus,³⁸³ which would give perfect sense to the entire phrase, as in Egyptian religious thought the lotus flower is one of the commonest images representing the solar god in his primeval/daily appearance at dawn: the god sprouts as sweet lotus from a field of

³⁷⁹ For other meanings LSJ, 2, II.

³⁸⁰ LSJ, *λωτός* I, II; Weidner 1985, 50.

³⁸¹ Weidner 1985, 24–35.

³⁸² LSJ, *κύαμος* 2: e.g. Theophrastus Eresius, *Hist. plant.* 4.8.7–8, 8.8; Ryhiner 1986, 13; Weidner 1985, 33–5, 47–8.

³⁸³ Similarly Calvo Martínez 2004, 275.

lotus flowers (see 2.22A).³⁸⁴ Furthermore, the god personifying the lotus flower in itself was Nefertem who, though perhaps originally embodying sweet and pleasant perfume, soon became associated with the lotus of primeval times³⁸⁵ and, thus, with the east (where the sun rises) and with the warrior gods protecting the eastern boundaries. Also thanks to these associations, he finds his place as child god in the triad of Memphis and, as already seen, starts to be represented with a lion-like iconography as the son of Ptah and the lion goddess Sekhmet.³⁸⁶

An invocation such as the one in the *PDM*, ‘you are this lotus flower which came forth from the lotus bud’, is a later instance of a long-standing image.³⁸⁷ For example, in the *Book of the Dead* Ch. 81a, the deceased achieves regeneration by transforming himself into a lotus like the sun god at every rebirth: ‘I am this pure lotus which went forth from the sunshine . . . I am the pure one who issued from the fen.’ At Edfu the solar/child god is ‘the great lotus that came into being at the beginning’, and at Hibis Amun is ‘the great lotus that is in his mat’.³⁸⁸

4 This image has been interpreted as referring to the god’s power in relation to the Nile. More precisely, the ‘foam’ would be the foam produced by the water breaking on boulders at the first cataract (MT), or the foam produced at the river’s mouth (Pr).³⁸⁹ So the solar god would be the one ‘who makes mild foam gush out from the pure mouths of the river’ since creator gods are responsible, among other things, for the origin of water – one of the life-giving elements together with wind/air

³⁸⁴ Cf. the translations in Pr ‘aus goldenem Bohnenfelde emporspringender Honiglotosbaum’ and MT ‘Lotusblüte, die aufsprösst aus dem goldenen Blütenfeld’ (but without explanations).

³⁸⁵ Cf. Morenz and Schubert 1954; Weidner 1985, 113–17; cf. Anthes 1955 and 1957.

³⁸⁶ Meeks 1971, 33–4.

³⁸⁷ *PDM* xvi 45 [II 17].

³⁸⁸ E.g. E V 348.4 in Alliot 1949, 215, trans. 219; Hibis, Klotz 2006, IV.21; also Khonsu at Karnak, Mendel 2003, 106–7, §5; *LGG* IV.298.

³⁸⁹ Similarly Calvo Martínez 2004, 275–6.

and light.³⁹⁰ Certainly, στόμα ('mouth', 'lips' in the plural) can also mean either 'source' or 'mouth' of a river, but if these στόματα have to be καθάρá, 'pure', they are more likely to refer to a river source than a mouth. The use of the plural 'sources' could be easily explained considering that in Egyptian mythical geography the two caverns of Elephantine were metaphorically imagined as sources of the Nile because the Nile enters Egypt at the first cataract.³⁹¹ This two caverns/sources/first cataract overlap could justify not only the use of the plural, but also the presence of the 'foam'.³⁹²

On the other hand, the comparison with Egyptian hymnography could also suggest a different interpretation since the element water is often equated with the bodily humours of the creator deity, especially saliva. For example, it is said about Ptah that 'the wave came into being from the humours of his body', or that 'nothing can live without you until the air comes out of your nose and the wave out of your mouth'.³⁹³ Therefore, καθαρῶν στομάτων could refer to the pure lips of the god from which he makes the mild foam of the Nile gush out or, more generally, any kind of water. Following this hypothesis the use of the term ἀφρός would not create many problems since, apart from 'foam of the sea' or 'of a river', it also means 'foam of a person', 'froth'. In this context, the adjective ἥμερος, 'tame', 'gentle', 'benign', 'calm', could stress that this foam/froth is the life-bringer saliva of the god and it is not to be seen as the outcome of a display of rage, or rabies, as it normally would be.

Alternatively, the phrase could have no relation to the Nile, its sources, or water in general, but it would mean that the god

³⁹⁰ See **Intro.** p. 46.

³⁹¹ They were probably considered the sources of the 'Nile of Lower Egypt' and not the authentic sources of the Nile, which Egyptians knew were further south: Wainwright 1953.

³⁹² As MT seem to think, though keeping the translation 'aus reinem Mund'.

³⁹³ P. Berlin 3048, III.8, VI.2-3; Zibelius-Chen, *LdÄ* 'Speichel'.

makes ‘the breath’ spout from the pure mouths of men or from his own pure lips. It has been mentioned how Egyptian solar-creator deities, as givers of life, give off their *ṯ3w*, ‘breath’ – identified with the wind – or make it come out from the mouth or nostrils of men (see 4.1, 3). The examples in Egyptian hymnography are numerous. For example, speaking of Amun: ‘it is in allowing throats to breathe that he spits out wind’ (*išš.f ṯ3w hr srk htyt*);³⁹⁴ speaking of other deities: ‘In order to make the throats breathe through the breath that comes out of his mouth’, ‘you who throw the breath from the interior of your throat for the nostrils of men’.³⁹⁵ Considering also that, as the god gives breath, he can also take it away, the subsequent general idea is that breath is meant for the good and worthy and not for the evil: ‘The breath which comes from him (Ptah) is pleasant for the one he loves’, ‘(Amun) who gives the breath to anyone he loves’.³⁹⁶ Similarly, the deity gives the breath not only to worthy living people, but also to the ‘justified’ dead³⁹⁷ who, having been acquitted through an act of speech (the negative confession),³⁹⁸ can be described as having ‘sound’, ‘free from evil’, mouths, i.e. ‘pure’: e.g. ‘so that I reach the condition of blessed dead, at peace, as my mouth is pure’.³⁹⁹

Following this interpretation, *καθαρῶν στομάτων* could refer either to the mouths of the pure ones, from which the god makes the breath gush out, or to the pure lips of the god that spit the breath. The only problem would remain the use of the term *ἄφρος*, but in the Egyptian symbolic conception the breath/wind and the saliva/water are often found in close association. They can appear together as the former is supposed to come from the nose of the god and the latter from the

³⁹⁴ Hibis, Klotz 2006, I.6. Cf. *LGG* VI.434–5 (*srk htyt*, ‘the one who allows the throats to breathe’, and 435–7 for similar epithets); cf. also *LGG* (*Īmn-R*) VIII.68–9.A.5.

³⁹⁵ P. Berlin 3048, III.10; O. Cairo 25209, 9; also in magical texts, cf. e.g. the Metternich Stele line 23, Sander-Hansen 1956, 23, 28.

³⁹⁶ P. Berlin 3048, XII.2; cf. Assmann 2001a, 197–8.

³⁹⁷ E.g. *BoD* 151, 175.

³⁹⁸ See I n.137.

³⁹⁹ Stele BM 834, 3.

mouth, e.g. ‘the saliva inside your mouth is a rain cloud,⁴⁰⁰ the breath of your nose [is a hurricane]’.⁴⁰¹ But sometimes the breath/wind can be associated with the mouth and the water with the nose: for example, speaking about Sobek, ‘the wind comes out of his mouth and the north wind comes out of his nose’ or about Hapi (the inundation), ‘if he is late, the nose remains obstructed’.⁴⁰² Therefore, water/spittle and wind/breath are conceived as potentially interchangeable as they are both elements fundamental for human life emanating from the deity.⁴⁰³ Hence, the use of ἀφρός should not be considered too binding on the choice of a specific translation, and our ἀφρὸν ἡμερον could be more similar than it seems to the ‘sweet breath’, *ḫw nḏm*, of Egyptian hymnography. Moreover, to a Greek ‘audience’ the word ἀφρός would have immediately recalled the birth of Aphrodite emerging from the foam (Aphrogeneia, ‘the foam-born’),⁴⁰⁴ and thus the total absence of references to this myth or to this deity seems to confirm the non-Greek origin of the passage.

In conclusion, this verse could be the result of the merging of different images that had a similar stylistic pattern in Egyptian poetry: the god making the Nile spout from its sources, spitting the water from his lips, and gushing out the breath from his mouth or from the mouths of the pure ones. Whichever interpretation we choose, it can be traced back to Egyptian tradition, and describes the deity as a life-giving creator and nourisher.

5 κάνθαρε, κύκλον ἄγων σπορίμου πυρός: See 3.10–11. This phrase seems to describe the assimilation between the

⁴⁰⁰ On this connection among the saliva, the water and the cloud, cf. also the Sanskrit *abhrām*, ‘cloud’, from which derive both the Greek ἀφρός and the Latin *imber*, ‘rain’, ‘rain cloud’.

⁴⁰¹ P. Berlin 3048, VI.2–3, V.7–8.

⁴⁰² Kom Ombo hymn, 8; Hymn to the Nile, II d; cf. the verb *išš*, ‘to spit’, used for the god giving off his breath in the example above.

⁴⁰³ On the long-standing association between breath and spittle in Egyptian tradition, Ritner 1993, 88–9.

⁴⁰⁴ E.g. Hes. *Th.* 190–1, 196; *HH* 6.1–5.

dung ball rolled by the scarab beetle and the sun disc moved across the sky.⁴⁰⁵

αὐτογένεθλε: See 1.32 and 3.10–11. Puns based on the words *hpr*, ‘scarab’, and *hpr*, ‘to come into being’, are already attested in the Pyramid Texts, where we find the scarab (*hpr*) addressed as ‘the self-engendered one’ (*hpr-ds.f*).⁴⁰⁶

6 ὅτι δισύλλαβος εἶ, ΑΗ: This should allude to a secret name of the deity, consisting of two syllables articulated around the vowels A and H. It has been suggested the hidden name could be the tetragrammaton YHWH in one of its possible vocalizations, yAhwĒh.⁴⁰⁷

πρωτοφανής: Both πρωτοφανής and its variant πρωτοφαής are late formations in Greek (not attested before the second century AD). In particular, πρωτοφαής can be used for the light of the moon reappearing after the phase of invisibility,⁴⁰⁸ and in general our epithet recalls τὸ πῦρ τὸ φανέν πρῶτον, ‘the fire which first appeared’ (1.33), used for the first manifestation of the sun god at the beginning of time. Considering the many Egyptian images of the hymn, πρωτοφανής could be seen as a Greek rendering of the Egyptian *hpr-m-sp-tpy*, ‘the one who came into being in the first time’, a common epithet of primeval gods.⁴⁰⁹

7 νεῦσον ἐμοί, λίτομαι: A similar combination is found only in Pind. *Pyth.* 1.71, within a prayer to Zeus. While λίσσομαι is frequent in invocations to the gods (see 2.10), the imperative of

⁴⁰⁵ In the Hermopolitan theology either a child or a scarab can emerge from the primordial lotus (see I n.216).

⁴⁰⁶ E.g. Pyr. 1587; Bergman 1982, 32; Ritner in Betz 1992, 57 no.134.

⁴⁰⁷ Pr 1941, 214 assumes a derivation from the Egyptian *Īhy*, Ihy the son of Hathor, but with no precise explanation; if this were the case, we would have another name of a child solar god which would fit the general description of the deity. MT reports also another possibility: an alternative form of Proteus in the vocative, Πρωτῆ, where A, as ordinal number ‘first’, would stand for πρωτ- and H for the vocative ending (which is a little stilted). On similar allusions to the name of God, Dornseiff 1988, 108–9.

⁴⁰⁸ Pausanias Attic. α 116.14; Triphiodorus, 517.

⁴⁰⁹ LGG V.699–700.

CONCLUSIONS

νεύω is much rarer (especially before the end of the fourth century) although the verb is used for the assent of deities already in Homer.⁴¹⁰

ὅτι σύμβολα μυστικά φράζω: The mystic symbols are the following secret names of the god.

8–9 ηωαιουαμερροουωθιῶη: Ουα could be Egyptian for *w*‘, ‘one’, ουωθι Egyptian for *wḏ*ʒ, ‘sound’,⁴¹¹ and μερρ might correspond to *mr*, ‘beloved’, a common Egyptian epithet.⁴¹²

μαρμαρνωθ: From the Aramaic, ‘lord of lights’, or from the Syriac, ‘lord of lords’, certainly a name with solar associations.⁴¹³

λαῖλαμ: See 2.22B.

σουμαρτα: From the Hebrew root *šmr*, ‘protect’, ‘guard’.⁴¹⁴

10 ἴλαθί μοι, προπάτωρ: See 1.32.

μοι σθένος αὐτὸς ὁπάζεις: A similar combination is not otherwise attested, but both σθένος and ὁπάζω are very frequent in Homer, where, as in later literature, the ‘things’ to be granted are usually glory, prosperity, or good fortune.

CONCLUSIONS

The hymn opens with the *epiclēsis* (lines 1–6) directly followed by a *euchē* (lines 7–10) embedded in the magical ritual (added

⁴¹⁰ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.523–8; for the imperative e.g. (Phaedimus) *AP* 6.271.6; *OH* 65.7; cf. its frequency in Synesius’ *Hymns*, e.g. 1.377, 510, 615, 719, 721. Rare also in the *PGM*: IV 2248 (11.8), 2933. One might wonder if in this context νεῦσον echoes the nodding of the animal protomes of the processional bark which were used to communicate the divine response in the traditional oracular consultations, cf. Altenmüller, *LdÄ* ‘Amunsbarke’, 248–51; von Lieven 1999, especially 79–95; Ray 1981; Blackman 1925 and 1926; Römer 2003; Volokhine 2001; Quaegebeur 1977. Cf. **Concl.** n.7.

⁴¹¹ BG.

⁴¹² BG; for the Egyptian epithets see *LGG* II.280–1 (*w*‘), 643–4 (*wḏ*ʒ), III.333–4 (*mr*).

⁴¹³ BG; Bonner 1950, 154, 182–3; Mastrocinque 2003, 103; cf. Bohak 2008, 209.

⁴¹⁴ BG; Mastrocinque 2003, 104. Cf. Fauth 1995, 39.

vores magicae and reference to the magician's actions). Again, the participial phrases seem to serve as epithets excluding the presence of proper narrative (cf. Conclusions to 1 and 2). Various identities have been suggested for the deity invoked. Preisendanz placed the composition among the hymns to Helios interpreting the addressee as Helios-Horus,⁴¹⁵ while MT thought of Proteus (see line 2). Delatte and Derchain, in their edition of Graeco-Egyptian magical amulets, quote this hymn in order to underline the association between 'the sources of fire' and the typically magical deity Chnoubis, whom they recognize as the addressee of the invocation⁴¹⁶ since he often appears on magical gems and is represented as a curled-up serpent with a raised lion head encircled by beams. Originally a decanic entity, Chnoubis became a powerful solar deity associated with the Jewish God.⁴¹⁷

Even if the idea of identifying the god invoked with Chnoubis is tempting, the hymn calls him not only 'serpent' and 'lion', but also 'lotus' and 'scarab'. They are all typical forms in which the Egyptian solar-creator god can manifest himself, especially in his primordial/child aspect (lines 1, 3, 5).⁴¹⁸ Furthermore, they remind us of the so-called pantheistic trigrams, i.e. units of three hieroglyphs that began to be used as names of the supreme solar god starting from the XXI Dynasty onwards. There are two of them: sun with beams/scarab/bent man leaning on a stick; and lotus leaf/lion/ewe. The latter, in Egyptian *srpt-m3t-srt*, in its Greek transliteration Σερφουθμουισρω, is often used as *vox magica* in the *PGM* and on magical amulets. Even if their phonetic and cryptographic interpretations can be numerous, their symbolic

⁴¹⁵ III.25, no. 3, apparatus 6.

⁴¹⁶ DD, 54–72.

⁴¹⁷ See Dasen and Nagy 2012; Mastrocinque 2003, 59, 78–82, 92–3; Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 224–5. Cf. Sethe, *RE* 'Chnoubis'; Kákosy 1986, 430; Fauth 1995, especially 66–74; Mundkur 1983, 119–20; Faraone 2011b, 51–2.

⁴¹⁸ Cf. *PDM* Suppl. 65 [6], 163, 162 [22] where the performer identifies himself with a scarab and a lion, and a scarab and a snake (used as symbols of the solar deity).

CONCLUSIONS

meaning is certain: they synthesize the three aspects of the sun (dawn, midday, sunset, Khepri-Re-Atum), and thus are often found in connection with supreme-solar gods.⁴¹⁹ Our hymn does not contain all the six symbols of the trigrams, but there are certainly three of them: two referring to the sun at dawn (lotus, scarab), and one to the sun at midday (lion). Perhaps it is not a coincidence that $\sigma\rho\omega$ appears among the god's 'greatest names' in a string of *voces magicae* in the prose section of the spell (line 1010): it is merely the final part of $\Sigma\epsilon\rho\phi\omicron\upsilon\theta\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\rho\omega$, corresponding to the Egyptian *srt*, 'ewe', symbolizing the sun at sunset.⁴²⁰ Furthermore, the remaining epithets fit this interpretation, as they stress the solar and primordial nature of the god, and often have a precise Egyptian equivalent. At the same time, the prose spell four times addresses 'Horus Harpocrates' followed by a string of *voces magicae* among which $\acute{\alpha}\rho\sigma\alpha\mu\omega\sigma\iota$ – from the Egyptian *Hr-smsw*, 'Horus the Elder', or rather *Hr-š3^c-ms*, 'Horus who was born first'.⁴²¹ Therefore, it is perfectly in line with the hymn since it invokes a solar-creator deity (Horus the Elder/who was born first) stressing his primordial/dawn aspect (Harpocrates).⁴²²

In conclusion, in spite of the Homeric verse (line 2), which seems to have been inserted because of the context, the deity invoked is certainly Egyptian in nature. Unlike the previous hymns, the interpretation is almost unequivocal owing to the simultaneous appearance of very distinctive attributes such as 'lotus', 'scarab', 'snake', 'lion', 'self-engendered'. While before

⁴¹⁹ Ryhiner 1977; Koenig 2009, 315–20; cf. Mastrocinque 2003, 106.

⁴²⁰ J. F. Quack: the vocalization implies the feminine form *srt*. Cf. also II 101–15 and XII 87–93, where Apollo-Helios-Horus can manifest himself according to the four cardinal points: in the north he is a child sitting on a lotus, and in the east he is a winged $\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omega\nu$. Totti 1988: these depictions would be the literary pendant of the iconographical representations of the polymorphic sphinx god Tutu-Thithoes, in his turn strongly connected with Horus-Harpocrates (not particularly convincing).

⁴²¹ Appearing in IV 988–9, 999–1000, 1048–9, 1075–6. See BG; the second reading was suggested by J. F. Quack.

⁴²² Fauth 1995, 108–9.

we were dealing with different traditions that found a consistent explanation in the light of Egyptian religious thought, in this case the hymn seems to stem directly from Egyptian sources, or at least from Egyptian imagery. The presence of the epithets *αὐτογένεθλε* and *προπάτωρ* within this context strengthens the hypothesis of their Egyptian origin (see 1.32). An interesting conceptual parallel can be found in the magical papyrus of the Brooklyn Museum, where Bes-Pantheos (accompanied by the pantheistic trigrams) is described with attributes that, in hymnography, are typical of Amun-Re: he is ‘the great lion who came into being by himself, the great eldest god of the primordial time . . . the wind comes out of his mouth to make live all the nostrils’,⁴²³ he enlightens the world and rules the inundation.

⁴²³ Sauneron 1970, 4.3–4; see **Intro.** pp. 47–9, cf. 1.11 pp. 77–8.

HYMN 6

HYMN TO APOLLO: II 2–7 (FOURTH CENTURY)

This brief hymn is part of a dream oracle (II 1–64) whose title is unknown as the beginning of the papyrus is missing. Lines 1–3 appear also in VI 25–7 with a few differences (8.16–18).

- Invocation: The **hymn** invokes Apollo to come and prophesy.
- Preliminaries and rite: A string of *voces magicae* is to be written on laurel leaves and spoken to a lamp before bedtime; the magician is to anoint his lips with a special mixture (in order to remember the god's words), purify the bed, and make a burnt offering. Furthermore, he has to wear a special laurel wreath with *voces magicae* written on every leaf, to prepare a special ink and an ointment that he will put in his ear while invoking the god, and to write a symbol on a leaf of cinquefoil that he will keep in his mouth while sleeping.
- Compulsive procedures: If the god does not appear, the magician has first to offer animal sacrifices and second to draw an image of the 'headless god' (see I n.175) on a piece of papyrus and then burn it completely or just suspend it over a lamp. If the god still does not appear, the magician should add another brief magical formula and use a special oil for the lamp.
- Notes: The magician has to draw two figures of the 'headless god': one, to be placed beside the head before going to sleep; the other, to be used in the compulsive procedure if needed.

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: MT⁴²⁴ (Pr reconstructed hymn 9).

⁴²⁴ I.36–7 and commentary.

HYMN 6

Φοῖβε, μαντοσύναισιν ἐπίρροθος ἔρχεο χαίρων, |
 Λητοΐδῃ, ἐκάεργε, ἀπότροπε, δεῦρ' ἄ[γ]ε, δεῦρο·
 δεῦρ' ἄγε, θεσπίζων, μαντεύεο | νυκτὸς ἐν ὥρῃ.
 αλλαλαλα· αλλαλαλα· σανταλαλα· ταλαλα. Λέγε τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα
 καὶ |

- 5 αὐτὸ ἐν ὑφαιρῶν πτερυγοειδῶς. (5)
 εἴ ποτε δὴ φιλόνικον ἔχων κλάδον ἐν|θάδε δάφνης
 [σῆ]ς ἱερῆς κορυφῆς ἐφθέγγεο πολλάκις ἐσθλά
 καὶ νῦν μοι σπεύσειας ἔχων θε[σ]πίσματ' ἀληθῆ·
 λαητωνιον καὶ ταβαραωθ αεω εω

2 δεῦρ' ἄγε, MT 6 διφυλον εσχεν εχων, P; τοι φίλον ἔσκεν,
 Eitrem 8 θεσπίσματ', MT

Translation

- Phoibos, helper through the arts of prophecy, come joyous,
 Leto's son, who dart afar, averter of evil, come here, here;
 come here, prophesying, give oracles in the night's hour.
 ALLALALA ALLALALA SANTALALA TALALA. [Speak also this name
 5 removing one (letter) in a wing shape].
 If ever, with a victory-loving laurel branch, you
 uttered good omens more than once here from your sacred peak,
 now too may you hasten towards me with truthful prophecies;
 ΛΑἚΤΩΝΙΟΝ and ΤΑΒΑΡΑΩΘΗ ΑΕΩ ΕΩ.

COMMENTARY

1 Φοῖβε: Traditional epithet of Apollo often used as alternative name of the god and especially frequent in the *Iliad* and in the *Homeric Hymn* to Apollo. Its meaning, 'pure', 'bright', suggested that Apollo might have originally had solar traits (see **1.7–9**).⁴²⁵

⁴²⁵ Cf. III 251–2 for Φοῖβος in the fragmentary hymn to Apollo (cf. **Intro.** p. 54).

ἐπίρροθος: Very rare and almost exclusively attested in epic and tragic poetry.⁴²⁶ This epithet, mainly used for Athena, opens a series of traditional, mainly Homeric, epithets of Apollo appearing in the *PGM* only here and in the parallel passage in VI 6–45 (8.16–18).

ἔρχεο χαίρων: This combination is attested only once in Nonnus, *Dion.* 20.281. Interestingly enough, the epic imperative ἔρχεο appears in the *PGM* not only here and in VI 43 (8.34) but also within an original Homeric verse listed in the *Homeromanteion* in VII 1–148.⁴²⁷

2 Three other traditional epithets of Apollo.

Λητοῖδης: A poetic epithet identifying the god as the ‘son of Leto’ (only here and in IV 26=8.17).⁴²⁸

ἐκάργης: ‘Far-darter’, or ‘far-worker’, another Homeric epithet typical of Apollo and his sister Artemis, possibly with a specific connection with their being archers (only here and in VI 26=8.17).⁴²⁹

ἀποτρόπαιος: The use of the adjective, and its variant ἀποτρόπαιος, as a divine epithet is post-Homeric but attested in tragedy and comedy, though very rarely in the vocative singular. It can be considered an equivalent of ἀλεξίκακος, another traditional epithet of Apollo which the god allegedly received after ending a pestilence afflicting the Athenians during the Peloponnesian war by an oracle from Delphi.⁴³⁰

2–3 In addition to these epithets, the very rare imperative μαντεύεο (apart from the parallel in VI 27=8.18) till the fifth century

⁴²⁶ Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad Il.* 4.390; Hes. *Op.* 560; Aesch. *Sept.* 378; Apoll. Rhod. 2.225, 1068.

⁴²⁷ VII 51*=*Il.* 9.43; also frequent in *OH*, e.g. 27.11, 14, 49.7.

⁴²⁸ E.g. *HH* 4 *passim*; Hes. *Sc.* 479; Theogn. *Eleg.* 1.1120; Aristoph. *Eq.* 1081; Apoll. Rhod. 1.66, 144, 2.181.

⁴²⁹ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.439 (Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad loc.*); *Od.* 8.323; *HH* 3, *passim* (especially 257, with Φοῖβε), 4, *passim* (especially 500, with Λητοῦς υἱός); Callim. *Hym.* 2.11 (Williams 1978, *ad loc.*); *OH* 34.7. Graf 2009, 14–19.

⁴³⁰ Paus. 1.3.4. E.g. Aesch. *Pers.* 203, Eur. *Ph.* 586; especially of Apollo, e.g. Eur. *HF* 821; Aristoph. *V.* 161, *Av.* 61, *Pl.* 359, 854. Graf 2009, 44, 91–4.

appears in literature only in the *Odyssey* and in a fragment of Pindar,⁴³¹ and the two hexametrical feet $\nu\kappa\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \ \acute{\epsilon}\nu \ \acute{\omega}\rho\eta$ are attested only here, in the parallel passage in VI 27 (8.18) and thrice in the *Homeric Hymn* to Hermes, always in final position as here.⁴³² Furthermore, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon \ \delta\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\omicron$ is almost exclusively Homeric (here and in VI 26=8.17), even if the repetition of the adverb, and in general any kind of repetition, is typical of magical literature.⁴³³ A standard example in the *PGM* is the phrase $\eta\delta\eta \ \eta\delta\eta \ \tau\alpha\chi\tilde{\upsilon} \ \tau\alpha\chi\acute{\upsilon}$, ‘immediately, immediately, quickly, quickly’, similarly hastening the deity to come. Apart from the hypnotic-magical power inherent in repetition, the frequency of this pattern in the *PGM* could have been fostered by contact with Egyptian language, which, as already seen (1.32), can use repetition as a form of superlative. Similar examples are attested in Egyptian spells, for example in the formula $m\bar{u} \ n.\bar{i} \ 3s \ sp2$, ‘come to me quickly quickly’.⁴³⁴ Finally, the fact that the god has to prophesy ‘at night’ corresponds to the spell being a dream oracle.

4–5 The magician is supposed to reproduce in speaking one of those schemata of *voces magicae* that we often find developed in writing in order to create a special visual effect. In this case, it is the ‘wing shape’, which consists in repeating a word in subsequent lines eliminating one letter (from the beginning or the end) at every new line till only one letter is left, so as to obtain a right-angle triangle.⁴³⁵

6–8 This passage is a *hypomnēsis*, typical of traditional Greek hymns (see **Intro.** p. 40). Not surprisingly, another *hypomnēsis*

⁴³¹ Hom. *Od.* 2.178; Pind. fr. 150.1 (Maehler); then once in Nonn. *Dion.* 39.165.

⁴³² *HH* 4.67, 155, 400. Cf. Vergados 2013, 49.

⁴³³ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 11.314, 17.179, *Od.* 11.561. For the repetition of $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\omicron$ in the *PGM*, e.g. II 98, III 496, VII 962–5. On repetition as a magical means, Brashear 1995, 3394, no. 22 with bibliography; Weinreich 1928, with more examples from classical authors; Szepes 1976, 208–11.

⁴³⁴ E.g. on the so-called Metternich Stele, line 116, in Sander-Hansen 1956, 52.

⁴³⁵ E.g. XXXIX; Brashear 1995, 3433–4; Dornseiff 1988, 63–7; Faraone 2013. For the *voces magicae*, Fauth 1995, 41 no. 39.

appears in VI 36–8 (8.27–9), but there the verses are drawn from the *Iliad*, while for our passage it is not possible to find a precise parallel. The opening formula, εἴ ποτε δῆ or εἴ ποτε, is typical of Homeric prayers, whether reminding the god of a previous good deed of the petitioner, or of a previous intervention of the god himself.⁴³⁶ However, the rest does not seem to show any specific Homeric pattern, even if many of the single words employed occur in Homer – apart from φιλόνικος, κλάδος and θέσπισμα.

The ‘reminder’ perfectly fits the dream oracle spell of which the hymn is part: as the god prophesied before, he is to come and do it again. Furthermore, the presence of a ‘laurel branch’ clearly alludes to the myth of Daphne, the nymph who rejected the love of Apollo and, exhausted by running away from him, asked the gods for help and was eventually transformed into a laurel tree. The god took some branches from his beloved and made himself a wreath. Whether this myth was pre-existent or just aetiological, the laurel was sacred to Apollo and played an important role in Apollonian divination.⁴³⁷ In the spell, both laurel leaves and a laurel wreath are essential to the procedure, and the use of the adjective φιλόνικος (in case this reading is accepted) in our hymn seems to allude to the laurel wreath that was given to the winners of the Pythian games held at the sanctuary of Apollo in Delphi.⁴³⁸

9 The first word is probably a distortion of Λητοῖδης, while no explanation has been suggested for ταβαραωθ. For the final vowels see 3.33.

⁴³⁶ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.39, 15.372, *Od.* 4.763; *HH* 2.64.

⁴³⁷ Hermann, *RAC* ‘Daphne’. E.g. Dion. Halicarn. *Ars rhet.* 1.6.13–15; Amandry 1950, 126–34; Parke and Wormell 1956, 3, 26, 30–1; Parke 1967, 75–6; Fontenrose 1978, 224–5; Fontenrose 1988, 55–6, 82–3, 108–9; Johnston 2008, 42–3, 50, 88, and 154–5 for the treatment of Daphne in these spells; Graf 2009, 67; see also Morrison 1981, 98–9; cf. Hopfner 1974–90, I.294–8. Cf. e.g. Eur. *Ion* 82–183.

⁴³⁸ Paus. 10.7.8. Cf. III 252 for laurel branches in the fragmentary hymn to Apollo (cf. **Intro.** p. 54). Cf. also Faraone 2004, 220.

CONCLUSIONS

The difference between this hymn and the previous ones is self-evident. The structural pattern is mainly that of the *euchē*, including a *hypomnēsis*, but all the attributes are easily traceable back to the traditional Apollo. The main divine aspects analysed up to this point (solar-creator, cosmic, primordial, life-giving) are neither mentioned nor implied. The language makes the hymn look like a Homeric collage and, together with the final *hypomnēsis*, testifies to the choice of continuity with the tradition of Greek poetry. Nevertheless, the insertion of a rubric and *voces magicae* suggests that the hymn was – at least – re-worked in a magical milieu.

HYMN 7

HYMN TO APOLLO-HELIOS: II 81–102 (FOURTH CENTURY)

This hymn is part of a complex dream oracle (II 64–183) entitled ἄλλως ποίησις as it is an ‘alternative procedure’ for the first spell of the papyrus in which 6 appears.

- Preliminaries and rite: The magician writes magical words on two laurel sprays and prepares a wreath with one of them. He makes a sacrifice, anoints himself with a special mixture and utters magical words into the lamp; then he goes to sleep.
- Invocation at sunrise: The **hymn** invokes Apollo so that he may come to prophesy. The conjuration proceeds in prose with a list of the forms the solar god assumes in the different cardinal points and a series of secret names mixed with *voces magicae*.
- Further preliminaries: The magician has to make burnt offerings, purify his bedroom, write magical words on and around the door, and prepare a special throne, inscribing it with other magical words.
- Compulsive procedure: If the god does not appear, the magician should prepare a piece of cloth with a drawing of the ‘headless god’ (see I n.175) to be used as a wick for the lamp, and should keep a state of purity before reciting the prescribed formulae.
- Drawing (to be copied on the piece of cloth used as a wick): headless figurine.
- Release: The god is dismissed pouring a libation, burning myrrh and reciting a brief formula.

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: MT (Pr reconstructed hymn 11).⁴³⁹

- Δάφνη, μαντοσύνης ἱερὸν φυτὸν Ἀπόλλωνος,
 ἧς ποτε γευσάμενος πετάλων | ἀνέφηνεν αἰοιδὰς
 αὐτὸς ἄναξ σκηπτοῦχος, Ἴηιε, κύδιμε Παιάν,
 ναίων ἐν Κολοφῶνι, ἱερῆς ἐπάκουσον αἰοιδῆς·
 5 ἔλθε τάχος δ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν (μοι) ὁμιλῶν,
 ἀμβροσίων στομάτων τε σταθείς ἔμπνευσον αἰοιδὰς,
 αὐτός, ἄλναξ μολπῆς, μόλε, μολπῆς κύδιμ' ἀνάκτωρ· (85)
 κλῦθι, μάκαρ, βαρὺμηνι, κραταιόφρων, κλύε, Τιτάν,
 ἡμετέρης φωνῆς νῦν, ἄφθιτε, μὴ παρακούσης·
 10 στήθι (δέ), μαν|τοσύνην (μοι) ἀπ' ἀμβροσίου στομάτιο
 ἔννεπε σῶ ἱκέτη, πανακήρατε, θᾶττον, Ἄπολλον. |
 τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος λέγε· χαῖρ(ετισμός)·
 χαῖρε, πυρὸς ταμία, τηλεσκόπε κοίρανε κόσμου,
 Ἥελιε κλυτόπωλε, | Διὸς γαιήοχον ὄμμα,
 15 παμφαές, ὑψικέλευθα, διπετές, οὐρανοφοῖτα,
 αἰγλήεις, ἀκίχητε, παλαιγενές, ἀστυφέλιкте, (90)
 χρυσομίτρη, φαλεροῦχε, πυρισθενές, αἰολοθώρηξ, |
 πωτήεις, ἀκάμας, χρυσήνιε, χρυσοκέλευθα,
 πάντας δ' εἰσορόων (τε) καὶ ἀμφιθέων | καὶ ἀκούων·
 20 σοὶ φλόγες ὠδίνουσι φεραυγέες ἡματος ὄρθρον,
 σοὶ δὲ μεσημβριόλωντα πόλον διαμετρήσαντι
 Ἀντολίη μετόπισθε ῥοδόσφυρος εἰς ἐὸν οἶκον |
 ἀχνυμένη στείχει, πρὸ δέ σου Δύσις ἀντεβόλησεν
 Ὀκεανῶ κατάγουσα πυριτρεφέων ζυγὰ πώλων, (95)
 25 Νῦξ φυγὰς οὐρανόθεν καταπάλλεται, εὖτ' ἂν ἀκούσῃ
 πωλικὸν | ἀμφὶ τένοντα δεδουπότα ῥοῖζον ἰμάσθλης,
 ααααααα· εεεεεε· ηηη|ηηηη· ιιιιι· οοοοοοο· υυυυυυ·
 ωωωωωωω· |
 Μουσάων σκηπτοῦχε, φερέσβιε, δεῦρό μοι ἦδη,
 δεῦρο τάχος δ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν, Ἴηιε | κισσεοχαῖτα·

⁴³⁹ MT, L48–50 and commentary; cf. Dilthey 1872, 383–5. The hymn was also annotated by Faraone 2004. Cf. also Tissi 2014: though this edition does not present any real novelty (since the author accepts almost all Preisendanz's emendations in the commentary), it gives many Greek parallels, especially for the use of single epithets and words.

HYMN TO APOLLO-HELIOS

- 30 μολπὴν ἔννεπε, Φοῖβε, δι' ἀμβροσίου στομάτιοι·
χαῖρε, πυρὸς μεδέων, αραραχχαρα ηφθησικηρε, (100)
καὶ Μοῖραι τρισσαὶ Κλωθὴ τ' Ἄτροπός τε Λάχης τε· |
σὲ καλῶ,
τὸν μέγαν ἐν οὐρανῷ,
35 ἀεροειδῆ, αὐτεξούσιον,
ᾧ ὑπετάγη πᾶσα φύσις,
ὃς | κατοικεῖς τὴν ὀ[λ]ην οἰκουμένην.

2 πεταλοισ, P; ἀνέφηνες, MT 4 ἐν κολοφω|νι ναιων,
P 5-6 συμ|γων {υδωρ} ἀμβροσιων, P 6 δε, P 7 μολε
κυδιμε μολπησ, P 11 τω, P; απολλῶ, P 12 χαῖρ/, P 16
ακί|χητα, P 18 ακαμνε, P 20 ορθρου, P 21 μεσημ-
βριο|εντι, P 22 αντολησ, P 23 στιχει προ δε σοι δυσεσ,
P 31 και σε, P 33-7 Non-metrical section 35 αυτοξου-
σιον, P 37 ωσ, P; ὄλην, MT

Translation

- Daphne-laurel, sacred plant of Apollo's divination,
whose leaves the sceptre-bearing lord himself once tasted and
revealed chants,
Ieios, renowned Paian,
who dwell in Colophon, give ear to the sacred chant.
5 Come quickly from the sky to the earth being in my company;
and stop, and inspire chants from the immortal lips,
you yourself, lord of song, come, renowned lord of song.
Listen, blessed one, angry-tempered, stern; now, Titan, listen to
our voice, immortal, do not ignore.
10 But stop, and tell me, your suppliant, a prophecy from your
immortal mouth,
quickly, O pure Apollo.
[Speak while the sun is rising. Greeting formula:]
Hail, fire's dispenser, far-seeing leader of the cosmos,
Helios with famous steeds, eye of Zeus which protects the earth,
15 shining, on a lofty path, falling from the sky, walking through the
heaven,

HYMN 7

bright, unattainable, born long ago, unshaken,
with the golden headband, plate bearing, mighty with fire, with
glowing breastplate,
flying, untiring, with golden bridles, who run along a golden path,
you who watch, surround and hear everybody;
for you the light-bringing flames of day give birth to dawn,
for you, who pass the axis of the universe at midday,
rosy-ankled Dawn goes in grief to her home behind you,
while in front of you Sunset meets
Ocean leading down the yoke of fire-fed steeds,
the fugitive Night throws herself down from the sky whenever she
hears
the hiss of the whip which resounds around the colt's tendon,
AAAAAAA EEEEEEE ÊÊÊÊÊÊ ÎÎÎÎÎ ÎÏÏÏÏÏÏ ÛÛÛÛÛÛ ÔÔÔÔÔÔ.
O sceptre-bearer of the Muses, giver of life, come here to me now,
come here quickly to earth, Ieios, with ivy-wreathed hair;
O Phoibos, tell the song through (your) immortal mouth;
hail, lord of fire, ARARACHCHARA ÊPHTHISIKÈRE,
and triple Moirai, Clotho and Atropos and Lachis.
I call you,
mighty in the sky,
air-like, with free will,
to whom all nature submitted,
who dwell in the whole inhabited world.

COMMENTARY

I-2 See 6.6–8. Laurel played an important role in divination so that both laurel wreaths and branches were often worn and carried by consultants of Apollonian oracles, and the Delphic Pythia was thought to shake a laurel plant or laurel branches during the revelation or even to chew laurel leaves as part of her preparatory rituals, possibly in order to go into a trance.⁴⁴⁰

⁴⁴⁰ E.g. Lycophr. 6. See **I** n.437.

Interpreting the verb γεύομαι *stricto sensu*, Apollo ‘tasted/sampled’ the leaves of Daphne/laurel, otherwise it could mean that he actually ate the plant – as the detail of the ‘leaves’ apparently suggests. In both cases the text seems to imply that Apollo’s divinatory skill derives from the laurel plant. However, in the traditional version of the myth the god already possesses his prophetic ability from which the laurel acquires its qualities.⁴⁴¹ The passage is paralleled in VI 6–7, 40 (8.1, 31), so it was clearly part of a pre-existent hymn: there, we find στεφθεῖς τε κλάδοισι, ‘(Apollo) wreathed with branches (of laurel)’, which would better fit the standard version of the myth. Thus, considering also the earlier date of 8, the passage in our hymn is likely to have been adapted under the influence of the laurel’s prestige as a prophetic plant.⁴⁴²

3 ἄναξ: See 1.1.

σκηπτοῦχος: Also at 28. Homeric epithet used in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* only for human kings. Afterwards, it is rare as a divine epithet⁴⁴³ until the *OH*, where it is used for Zeus, Pluto, the Mother of the gods, Dionysus and Aphrodite.⁴⁴⁴

Ἰήμει: Also at 29. Another traditional epithet of Apollo meaning ‘invoked with the cry ἰή’ which in the refrain ἰή παῖάν was characteristic of cultic hymns to the god.⁴⁴⁵ In the *PGM* it is found only here and within the same spell in II 132 in the sequence ἰή παῖάν.

κῶδιμει: Also at 85, cf. 11.38. Epithet of Hermes in Hesiod and in the *Homeric Hymn* addressed to this god.⁴⁴⁶ Afterwards, it is not attested as a divine epithet – unless we consider a few sporadic occurrences in Christian authors as a word applied to

⁴⁴¹ Hermann, *RAC* ‘Daphne’; Faraone 2004, 220–2.

⁴⁴² Cf. P. Oxy. 1011.218–80; Dornseiff 1988, 69. On the re-personification of the laurel in this hymn see also Johnston, forthcoming.

⁴⁴³ Worth mentioning an occurrence in the *HH* to Ares 8.6.

⁴⁴⁴ *OH* 15.6, 18.3, 27.4, 52.7, 55.11. Frequent also in Nonn. *Dion.* e.g. 2.570 (Typhon), 2.581 (Zeus).

⁴⁴⁵ Rutherford 2001a, 18–25; Furley and Bremer 2001, 1.84–91; cf. 1.1.

⁴⁴⁶ Hes. *Th.* 938; *HH* 4, *passim* (Vergados 2013, 266 *ad* 46).

Christ – outside the *OH*, where it is found as an epithet of Apollo and Sabazios.⁴⁴⁷

Παῖάν: See 1.1.

4 ναίων ἐν Κολοφῶνι: Instead of alluding to Delphi, the phrase refers to the oracle of Apollo Clarius which was situated in the village of Claros in the territory of Colophon, Ionia (see **Intro.** p. 34).⁴⁴⁸

5 ἐλθὲ τάχος: The god is hastened to come, as typical of magical compelling (see 6.2–3).⁴⁴⁹

ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν: The phrase is used twice by Homer to describe the descendent course of Helios, from midday to sunset, and once by Hesiod for the mist spreading from the sky on the earth at dawn.⁴⁵⁰ Here it states that the god is supposed to come from the sky, as in 1.7 Apollo had to come from Olympos.

6 ἀμβροσίων στομάτων: This combination (in the plural) is not attested in previous literature, but ἀμβρόσιος is standard in Homer to refer to anything divine/immortal (peploi, hair, sandals, food, the night, etc.) and in Hesiod the μολπή, 'song', of the Muses is said to be ἀμβροσία.⁴⁵¹

7 Apollo was traditionally the tutelary god of music and song even if in literature he is never called μολπῆς ἀνάκτωρ or ἄναξ.⁴⁵² To be noted is the choice of the imperative μόλε to fit the alliteration of μ.⁴⁵³

⁴⁴⁷ *OH* 34.5; 48.1. Cf. its equivalent κυδάλμιος, frequently found in Homer, but never as a divine epithet.

⁴⁴⁸ E.g. Strab. 14.1.27; Paus. 7.5.4; Aelian, *NA* 10.49. See Parke 1985, 112–70, 219–24; Johnston 2008, 76–82; Faraone 2004, 222; Lampinen 2013; Merkelbach and Stauber 1996, for the corpus of the oracles; Sfameni Gasparro 2002, 54–6; Várhelyi 2001, especially on the possible connection between this oracle and magical influences.

⁴⁴⁹ Imperative plus τάχῳ, e.g. IV 1921, VII 247, 330, VIII 84.

⁴⁵⁰ Hom. *Od.* 11.18, 12.381; Hes. *Op.* 548.

⁴⁵¹ Hes. *Th.* 69; Braswell 1988, *ad* Pind. *Pyth.* 4.299. For the use of the adjective in the poetic–musical field cf. Tissi 2014, *ad loc.*

⁴⁵² Cf. 1.1. Graf 2009, 33–51.

⁴⁵³ On alliteration in magic see 1.10 πακερβηθ and I n.61. Cf. III 249 for this imperative in the fragmentary hymn to Apollo (cf. **Intro.** p. 54).

8 κλυθι, μάκαρ: See 1.20.

βαρύμηνι: Apart from Aeschylus using it for a demon, the attestations of this adjective as a divine epithet are late and come mainly from the *OH*, employed for Pan, Zeus and Dionysus, and the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus, especially for Hera and Zeus.⁴⁵⁴

κραταιόφρων: This epithet is attested here for the first time, but the adjective κραταιός, ‘mighty’, is a standard Homeric epithet of fate and of gods.⁴⁵⁵ Subsequently, it reappears in Judaeo-Christian literature starting from the Septuagint.⁴⁵⁶ In Isidorus’ *Hymn* 2 κραταιός is an epithet of Sokonopis and in one of the versions of Manetho’s epitome of the kings of Egypt, which provides the Egyptian names with translations, it is used to translate *wsr*, ‘mighty’.⁴⁵⁷ Our epithet is a compound with φρήν, ‘heart’, ‘mind’, and considering that κραταιός is never found qualifying φρήν in previous literature, the formation of κραταιόφρων could have been influenced by the Egyptian epithet *wsr-ib*, formed with *ib*, a word meaning both ‘heart’ and ‘mind’, like φρήν.⁴⁵⁸ Thus, instead of meaning ‘stern’ (as usually interpreted), the epithet could be closer to the Egyptian ‘mighty of heart/mind’.

Τιτάν: See 3.13.

9–11 A series of imperatives urging the god to come and prophesy. The use of στήθι, ‘stop’, ‘stay still’, may suggest that the god is imagined as moving, which could be the first certain allusion (cf. line 5) to the solar nature of the god in this hymn.⁴⁵⁹

⁴⁵⁴ Aesch. *Ag.* 1482; *OH* 11.12, 20.4, 45.5; Nonn. *Dion.* e.g. 4.417, 6.171. Cf. Tissi 2014, *ad loc.*

⁴⁵⁵ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.83, 5.629, 16. 334, 853, etc. (fate), 13.345 (Zeus and Poseidon).

⁴⁵⁶ E.g. LXX, *De.* 7.21.3, 2 *Es.* 19.32.2, *Ps. Salom.* 4.24.2.

⁴⁵⁷ Isidorus, *Hym.* 2.9; Manetho, fr. 33.6, 37.9 (Müller), allegedly taken from Eratosthenes of Cyrene.

⁴⁵⁸ *LGG* II.571; cf. Piankoff 1930.

⁴⁵⁹ First as line 5, in spite of the Homeric parallel, does not necessarily have to mean that the god is solar: the sky could be his residence in the Olympos. Interestingly, the formula σὺ ἰκέτη appears also in Isidorus, *Hym.* 2.30 and Maiistas 45.

ἄφθιτε: See 2.10.

πανακήρατε: This adjective is first attested in a treatise of the *Corpus Hermeticum* incorporating passages of an epideictic speech praising the ‘kings’, written around the year 300; it is used to describe God as ‘completely pure’, ‘intact’, ‘unmixed’.⁴⁶⁰

12 This non-metrical line gives instructions about the time in which the recitation is to be performed and opens a new section in which some of the usual solar attributes can be finally recognized.

13 χαῖρε: See 5.1, 2.

πυρὸς ταμία: The attestations of this combination are late: in Libanius (fourth century), Hephaestus is ‘fire’s dispenser’ according to the tradition that saw him as the inventor of fire; in Nonnus the epithet is used for Hyperion, the Titan god of light father of Helios, and for Helios himself.⁴⁶¹ Similarly, it states the solar nature of the god in our hymn (see 1.33).

τηλεσκόπε κοίρανε κόσμου: See 1.9, 3.18 (for τηλεσκόπε) 4.2, 5 (for κοίρανε κόσμου). The rare adjective τηλεσκοπος when proparoxytone means ‘far-seen’ instead of ‘far-seeing’, and in both forms it mainly refers to the light of the sun.⁴⁶²

14 Ἥελιε κλυτόπωλε: The rare κλυτόπωλος in the *Iliad* is used exclusively for Hades, and later it can be found as an epithet of Poseidon and of Selene.⁴⁶³ In the *PGM* it also appears within an original Iliadic verse in the *Homeromanteion* of *PGM* VII.⁴⁶⁴ Though never attested as an epithet of Helios, it was probably chosen following the Greek tradition according to which the god traverses the sky driving a chariot (cf. 1.36–7, 7.20–6).

⁴⁶⁰ *Περὶ τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους* 18.12.1.

⁴⁶¹ Liban. *Or.* 60.9.6; Vian et al. 1976–2006 *ad* Nonn. *Dion.* 12.36. For other attestations see Tissi 2014, *ad loc.*

⁴⁶² E.g. Soph. *TrGF* 338 (sun beams); *AP* 2.1.77 (sun-Apollo’s light); cf. Hes. *Th.* 566, 569 (the fire stolen by Prometheus).

⁴⁶³ *Il.* 11.445 (Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad loc.*); Pind. fr. 243.2 (Maehler); Maximus, *Περὶ καταρχῶν* 5.75. 6.151, 261.

⁴⁶⁴ VII 63.

Διὸς γαίηοχον ὄμμα: See 3.18, where the qualification τέλειον could point to an Egyptian background not necessary in this context. Throughout Greek literature γαίηοχος is used in its meaning of ‘earth-moving/carrying’ and is a standard name of Poseidon.⁴⁶⁵ It is rarely applied to other deities, in which case its meaning shifts towards ‘who protects (ἔχω) the earth’, found once also as an epithet of Zeus.⁴⁶⁶

15–18 A long series of epithets mixing Homeric terms with later formations and aiming at ‘the full approach of the deity’s personality’;⁴⁶⁷ most of the epithets stress the solar nature of the deity and express concepts already found in different patterns. For example, both ὑψικελεύθης and οὐρανοφοίτης⁴⁶⁸ are comparable with ‘who wrap up/proceed around the great pole in ethereal paths/turns’ of 2.3.

διυπετές: It literally means ‘fallen from Zeus’, thus ‘from the sky’, and is regularly used for rivers⁴⁶⁹ and rain, but can also generally mean ‘divine’, ‘bright’: here the original meaning could describe more precisely the image of the light ‘falling’ on the earth. Three other Homeric adjectives follow διυπετής:

⁴⁶⁵ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 13.43 (Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad loc.*), *Od.* 1.68, 8.322 (Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988, *ad loc.*), 9.528; Hes. *Th.* 15; *HH* 4.187 (Vergados 2013, *ad loc.*); Pind. *Ol.* 1.25; Cornut. 42.21. Bernand 1969, 442 no. 114, I, where a variation of Hom. *Od.* 9.528 appears in a dedicatory epigram from Akhmim.

⁴⁶⁶ Aesch. *Supp.* 816.

⁴⁶⁷ Szepes 1976, 211–12.

⁴⁶⁸ Very rare and late formations, ὑψικελεύθης is never attested as a divine epithet (but Nonn. *Dion.* 43.183 uses ὑψικέλευθος for Phaethon) and in *AP* is used to describe the soul rising towards the sky: 9.207.3; οὐρανοφοίτης appears as an epithet of Hecate-moon in an oracle given by the goddess quoted by Porph. *De philo.* 151.3, and is otherwise used by Christian authors to refer to the ascension to the sky of e.g. saints, especially in Greg. Naz. e.g. *Carm. dog.* 474.8. For these and the other epithets of the passage see also Tissi 2014, *ad loc.*

⁴⁶⁹ Since Homer (LSJ; Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad Il.* 16.173–5; Heubeck, West and Hainsworth 1988, *ad Od.* 4.477), used for streams ‘swollen by rain’, and especially for the Nile: see Drew Griffith 1997. Here, given the long string of solar attributes, an epithet identifying the god with the water of the Nile is improbable, though possible in the Egyptian tradition.

αἰγλήεις,⁴⁷⁰ ἀκίχητος and παλαιγενής. Ἀκίχητος seems here to allude to the distance of the sun,⁴⁷¹ while παλαιγενής should allude to the Titan Helios as it is often used with specific reference to age exactly for the Titans who were thought to have preceded the Olympians.⁴⁷²

ἀστυφέλικτε: The term ἀστυφέλικτος was first used for a god by Callimachus, who states that being ‘unshakeable’ is part of the divine nature.⁴⁷³ Afterwards, it is rare in this usage, appearing mainly in Orphic literature and in Christian authors who apply it to God.⁴⁷⁴ Even rarer χρυσομίτρης, for example appearing as epithet of Dionysus and Phoebe.⁴⁷⁵ Φαλεροῦχος and χρυσοκελεύθης are *hapax legomena* and πυρισθενής appears in Nonnus as an epithet of Dionysus.⁴⁷⁶ Similarly, πωτήεις is not attested before the fourth century and never used as a divine epithet. On the other hand, αἰολοθώρηξ is found only here and in the *Iliad* as an epithet of heroes,⁴⁷⁷ and both ἀκάμας and χρυσήνιος are Homeric epithets respectively of the sun (see 2.2), and of Artemis and Ares.⁴⁷⁸

19 This verse not only expresses the same idea as 1.9, 3.24 (see Commentary *ad loc.*) but also imitates the Homeric ὅς πάντ’

⁴⁷⁰ E.g. of Olympos, Hom. *Il.* 1.352, 13.243, *Od.* 20.103; colts, *HH* 32.9; Dawn, Apoll. Rhod. 1.519, the sky, 4.615, 958, but also αἰγλήτης cultic epithet of Apollo 4.1716; Ps.-Apollod. 1.139.6.

⁴⁷¹ Since Hom. *Il.* 17.75 never used as a divine epithet till Nonn. *Dion.* (Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad* 6.367–8).

⁴⁷² Of people, Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad Il.* 17.561; divine epithet of the Titans e.g. Aesch. *Pr.* 220, 873; *Orac. Sib.* 2.321; in Nonnus, Dionysus can be παλαιγενής as Zagreus, the ‘eldest’ Dionysus of Orphic mythology.

⁴⁷³ Mineur 1984, *ad Hym.* 4.26.

⁴⁷⁴ *OH* 12.13 (Heracles); Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 243.22 (the body of Zeus); e.g. Greg. Naz. *Carm. moral.* 591.7; Didym. Caec. *De trinit.* 39.788.8. Similarly, in three oracles of Apollo Clarius describing the nature of god, Merkelbach and Stauber 1996, nos. 25.1, 26.14, 27.1 (see **Intro.** p. 34); also in inscriptions, e.g. SEG 8.497.3, 47.1517.5 (Herakles).

⁴⁷⁵ Soph. *OT* 209; Oppian, *Cyn.* 2.2.

⁴⁷⁶ Nonn. *Dion.* 24.6; cf. Jo. Malal. *Chronog.* 25.3.

⁴⁷⁷ Hom. *Il.* 4.489, 16.173.

⁴⁷⁸ Hom. *Il.* 6.205, *Od.* 8.285; much later used for Eos in Quintus, 5.395; Orph. *Arg.* 563; and for the sun in Procl. *Hym.* 1.1.

ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούει.⁴⁷⁹ Apart from all-reaching sight, Egyptian deities can also have all-reaching hearing, especially Amun-Re. The theme is developed around the divine ability to hear human prayers, and is attested in various contexts: personal names formed with the name of a god plus *sḏm*, 'to hear' (e.g. 'Re-hears'); epithets such as *sḏm-sprw*, 'the one who hears the prayers'; stelai on which ears are depicted, dedicated e.g. to Ptah, Amun and Horus as 'gods who hear'; the eastern temple at Karnak, which was dedicated to Amun 'of the hearing ear', *msḏr-sḏm*.⁴⁸⁰

20–6 MT suggest that this passage may allude to the three manifestations of the Egyptian solar god (dawn, midday and sunset).⁴⁸¹ However, there are no Egyptian images in the passage. In particular, Dawn, Sunset and Night are personified as separate deities, at least Sunset and the solar god are said to travel by chariot (cf. **1.36–7**, **7.14**), and Ocean is mentioned as the place where the sun sets: all are typical images of Greek descriptions of the sun's course. For example in the *Iliad* we find 'then into Ocean fell the bright light of the sun drawing black night over the face of the earth'.⁴⁸² Mimnermus says that 'Helios is destined to toil every day and there is never any respite for him and his horses, from the moment rose-fingered Eos (Dawn) leaves Ocean and rises in the sky', and Euripides that 'this radiant four-horse chariot, Helios, already shines over the earth, and at this ethereal fire the stars flee towards the sacred night'.⁴⁸³ In the *Homeric Hymns* 'the Sun was going down beneath the earth towards Ocean with his horses and chariot', or 'Eos, the early born, bringing light to men, was rising from deep-flowing Ocean', and 'then, when he

⁴⁷⁹ See **1.9** and **I n.40**.

⁴⁸⁰ *LGG* VI.738 (*sḏm-sprw*); Morgan 2004, especially 43–54; Luiselli 2011, 60, 195; Givon 1982; cf. Pettazzoni 1955b, 98–100; Sandman-Holmberg 1946, 69–72.

⁴⁸¹ MT, **I.29–30**.

⁴⁸² Hom. *Il.* 8.485–6 (Kirk et al. 1985–1993, *ad loc.*).

⁴⁸³ Mimm. fr. 12 (West); Eur. *Ion* 83–5.

(Helios) has stayed his golden-yoked chariot and horses, he rests there upon the highest point of heaven, until he marvelously drives them down again through heaven to Ocean'.⁴⁸⁴ Therefore, an Egyptian background does not necessarily seem to underlie the passage, which could have been constructed by re-elaborating some traditional descriptions of the sun journey. The language is the usual mixture of late formations – *φεραυγής* and *πυριτρεφής* (appearing almost exclusively in Nonnus), *ρόδόσφυρος*⁴⁸⁵ and *καταπάλλομαι* (not attested before the fourth century, but cf. Hom. *Il.* 19.351) – and 'Homeric' terms such as *ὄρθρος*, *μετόπισθε*, *ἄχνημαι*, *ἀντιβολέω*, *ιμάσθλη*, etc.

27 See 3.33. Here every vowel is repeated seven times, stressing the connection with the seven planets.

28 Μουσάων σκηπτούχῃ: See line 3. Whether the epithet refers to the three Muses, daughters of Apollo, who embody the lowest, middle and highest strings of the lyre, or to the nine Muses, goddesses of artistic inspiration, it stresses the traditional image of Apollo as the god of music. He appears in connection with the Muses in Homer, and from Pindarus onwards bears the epithet *μουσηγέτης*, 'leader of the Muses'.⁴⁸⁶

φερέσβι: This is a standard epithet of the Earth from Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymn* to Apollo onwards. The countertrend is represented by the *OH*, where it is used for Helios, and by a few Christian authors who apply it to Christ, especially Gregory of Nazianzus.⁴⁸⁷ The shift was possibly fostered by contact with Egyptian religion – and landscape – where the sunlight was considered a fundamental life-giving element

⁴⁸⁴ *HH* 4.68, 184–5 (Vergados 2013, *ad loc.*), 31.14–15.

⁴⁸⁵ Though echoing the Homeric *ρόδοδάκτυλος Ἥως*, 'rosy-fingered Eos'.

⁴⁸⁶ Hom. *Il.* 1.603, *Od.* 8.488; Pind. fr. 94c (Maehler); Graf 2009, 39–41.

⁴⁸⁷ Hes. *Th.* 693; *HH* 3.341; *OH* 8.12 (also in 10.12, but for Nature in line with the traditional usage); e.g. Greg. Naz. *Carm. de se* 1326.6.

(together with water and wind) while the earth was not (see **Intro.** p. 46).

29 See line 5. *Κισσεοχαΐτης* is a *hapax* but *κισσεύς*, ‘wreathed with ivy’, can be found as an epithet of Dionysus and is attested for Apollo in Aeschylus.⁴⁸⁸ The presence of an epithet of Dionysus attributed to Apollo may be explained by their ‘partnership’ at Delphi.⁴⁸⁹

30 See line 6 and 6.1.

31 *χαΐρε*: See 5.1.

πυρὸς μεδέων: See 2.2.

αραραχχαρα ηφθησικηρε: *Αχχα* could be the first decan of Pisces, while *φθησικηρε* for *φθισικηρε* would be a Greek formation meaning ‘the one who destroys death’.⁴⁹⁰

32 The Moirai could be invoked here for the same reason as in 1.30–1: as an epithet of the god they express his control over the tripartite division of time and, thus, his solar cyclical nature. However, they could also represent human destiny and be mentioned to state Apollo’s control over it as oracular god.

33–7 These final lines are unmetrical and thus should probably be excluded from the hymn, but they have been kept here because, without them, the hymn would appear slightly ‘unfinished’. Preisendanz emended the passage to fit the metre, possibly for the same reason.

34 *τὸν μέγαν ἐν οὐρανῷ*: See **Intro.** p. 31. Certainly not a common Greek epithet, the phrase recalls the Egyptian *wr-m-pt*, ‘great in the sky’, typical epithet of Amun-Re and solar gods.⁴⁹¹ However, in Plato, subsequently quoted by many authors, Zeus is the ‘great leader in heaven’, *ὁ μέγας ἡγεμὼν ἐν οὐρανῷ*, who drives a winged chariot.⁴⁹²

⁴⁸⁸ *TrGF* 341.1. See also Tissi 2014, *ad loc.*

⁴⁸⁹ See Jeanmaire 1951, 187–98; Amandry 1950, 196–200; Sfameni Gasparro 2002, 137–41; on their ‘partnership’ outside Delphi see Detienne 2001.

⁴⁹⁰ Quack 1995, 115; BG.

⁴⁹¹ *LGG* II.435–6 (*ibid.* cf. *wr-n-pt*, ‘the great of the sky’).

⁴⁹² Plato, *Phdr.* 246e4.

35 ἀεροειδῆ: Normally not attested as a divine epithet,⁴⁹³ ‘air-like’ recalls the cosmic god (see 1.11) whose ‘mind is the ether’ (Greek) or whose ‘body is the wind’ (Egyptian), see 2.1, cf. 4.1, 3. However, it could be used here for the sun god as a synonym of ‘ethereal’.

αὐτεξούσιον: The adjective is especially used by Jewish and Christian authors to refer to human ‘free will’, and very rarely for the ‘independent authority’ of God, and thus as a synonym of ‘supreme’.⁴⁹⁴ Here it means that the will of the solar deity is totally free, as he is not subjected to any other deity.

36–7 These lines probably show a Judaeo-Christian influence since both the verb ὑποτάσσω⁴⁹⁵ (for the general sense see δέσποτα/ κοίρανε κόσμου /παντός, 2.10, 4.2, 5) and the idea of the ὅλη οἰκουμένη are used in relation to God, especially in this milieu. In particular, the ‘inhabited world’ can be said to be the Lord’s.⁴⁹⁶ Furthermore, the verb and the substantivized participle, forming a *figura etymologica* in our verse, are often found together in standard expressions such as οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν οἰκουμένην, ‘the ones who dwell in the inhabited world’, i.e. everybody. Here it is the god who has become the one ‘dwelling in the entire inhabited world’: it could hardly be an allusion to his cosmic nature (1.11) but possibly to the extent covered by the sunlight.

In any case, this expressive pattern was not confined to the Judaeo-Christian milieu, since for example a Greek graffito from the temple of Seti I at Abydos tells us that the god Bes

⁴⁹³ Apart from *OH* 38.22, where it is used for the Curetes identified with the winds. In the form ἡεροειδῆς it is used by Homer meaning ‘misty’, e.g. *Od.* 2.263.

⁴⁹⁴ E.g. Philo, *De ebriet.* 44.1; Fl. Joseph. *AJ* 15.266.5.

⁴⁹⁵ E.g. LXX, 1 *Ch.* 22.18.3 (ὑπετάγη ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον κυρίου, ‘the earth was subdued in front of the Lord’), 2 *Ma.* 9.12.3; NT, 1 *Cor.* 15.27.

⁴⁹⁶ E.g. LXX, *Ps.* 24.1–3 (τοῦ κυρίου ἡ γῆ . . . ἡ οἰκουμένη καὶ πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ, ‘The earth is the Lord’s . . . the world, and they that dwell therein’); Clem. Al. *Protr.* 8.79.6.4–6.

CONCLUSIONS

is διὰ ὅλης οἰκουμένης μαρτυρούμενον, 'testified to throughout the whole inhabited world'.⁴⁹⁷

CONCLUSIONS

After a few verses addressing both Daphne and Apollo (lines 1–4), the hymn proceeds with a long *euchē* (lines 5–11) interspersed with epithets and followed by the proper *epiclēsis* (lines 13–19). Then, we find the *eulogia* (lines 20–6); even if the passage describes the solar course, thus an always-true cyclic event, the involvement of multiple subjects other than the solar god and the development of the sentences in units longer than one line with as many as four enjambments in seven verses, give the section a marked narrative flavour. Similarly, the opening not only mentions a cultic toponym,⁴⁹⁸ but for the first time it alludes to a specific mythological episode which somehow serves as a *hypomnēsis*: as Apollo revealed chants thanks to Daphne/laurel, now he has to prophesy thanks to the laurel that the magician uses in the procedure. The hymn ends with a sort of *euchē* (lines 28–30, 31–7) whose second half is non-metrical and could have originated in a Judaeo-Christian background.

The passage 5–11, rich in traditional Greek attributes of Apollo, despite the insistence on the god's prophetic role in the ritual, does not display any specifically magical reference and could also derive from the cultic setting of oracular consultations.⁴⁹⁹ On the other hand, section 13–26 contains almost all the solar references and, with its juxtaposition of Homeric language and late or new formations, looks as if it was a late

⁴⁹⁷ Perdrizet and Lefebvre 1978, nos. 492, 500. Cf. also Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.14–24 (Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.*) expressing the same idea but with different words.

⁴⁹⁸ Cf. 1.3, and the metronymic in 6.2: they provide indirect information about the god's mythology.

⁴⁹⁹ On the relation between traditional divination and the *PGM*, Hopfner 1974–90, II.1.96–114, 312–17; on the adaptation of temple rituals for the private setting of the *PGM* see Smith 1995.

HYMN 7

Helios hymn pasted into the composition, as suggested by the introductory rubric. While **6** stuck to Homeric patterns as the addressee was the traditional Apollo, **7** as a whole incorporates later language since Apollo is identified with the Hellenistic Helios. However, as the two deities started to be assimilated as early as the fifth century BC, the nature of the god invoked cannot be said to lie outside Greek religious tradition.⁵⁰⁰ There are some new epithets (e.g. line 8 βαρύμηνι, 11 πανακήρατε, 15 ὑψικέλευθα) and a few that could derive from different backgrounds (line 8 κραταιόφρων, 13 κοίρανε κόσμου, 28 φερέσβιε, and lines 35–7) but they do not have a univocal interpretation and still fit the image of the solar god. There is no actual mention of the cosmic or creative aspect, and the deity does not play any role in the Underworld. Furthermore, the insistence on the iconography of the god in armour riding the sun's chariot (line 14 κλυτόπωλε, 17 φαλεροῦχε, αἰολοθώρηξ, 18 χρυσήνιε, and lines 24–6) and the allusion to Daphne's myth leave no doubt that the hymn shows continuity with Greek tradition.

⁵⁰⁰ See **I** n.34.

HYMN 8

HYMN TO APOLLO: VI 6–45 (SECOND/THIRD CENTURY)

This long prayer for an ‘encounter with Helios’ occupies almost the entire *PGM* VI; the beginning of the spell (VI 1–47) in which it was included is missing, but from the last two lines it is possible to infer that this was a dream oracle: ‘... give ... oracles at night since you tell the truth through dream oracles’. After a few directions about the best time to perform the rite, the **hymn**, to be said to the rising sun, begins with an address to Daphne-laurel; from line 16 (23), Apollo himself is invoked to come and give oracles; the final section addresses Daphne again.

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: Pr (also reconstructed hymn 10, 13, 14).

	δάφνη, μαντοσύνης] ἱερὸν φυτὸν Ἀπόλλω[νο]ς,	
	Φ]οῖβος στεφθεῖς τε κλάδοισι	
] κεφαλὴν κομόωσαν ἐθειραῖς	
]ον ἑαῖς παλάμαισι τινάσσων	
5]ησι πολυπτύχου, ὑψηλοῖο	(10)
]ξρις, θέσπιζε βροτοῖσιν	
	μεγα]λόστονος αὐτὸς Ἀπόλ[λ]ων	
] . . η παρθένε δ[ε]ινὴ	
]μενῶ ἱεροῖσι π[ε]δίλοις	
10	[θαλ]λὸν ἑμαῖς μετὰ [χε]ρσὶν ἔχοντι	(15)
	[π]έμψον μάντευμ[ά τ]ε σεμνὸν	
	[] . σαφηνέσι φοιβή[σα]σα	
	[]ν τε καὶ ὥς τετελε[σ]μένον ἔσται,	
	[] ἴν' ἔχω[v] περὶ [παντὸς ἐ]τάζω	
15	[δα]μασά[v]δρα μ[]ανδρα	(20)

Lines 21–4 are too fragmentary and also broken by *voces magicae*. Certainly recognisable in 23 Παιάν, 24 πολυώνυμε and Φοῖβε.

- [μ]αντοσύναισιν [ἐπ]ίρροθε, Φοῖβε Ἀπόλλ[ον], (25)
 [Λ]ητοῖδῃ ἐκάεργε, [θε]οπρόπε, δεῦρ' ἄγε, δε[ῦρο],
 δεῦρ' ἄγε, θεσπίζω[ν], μαντεύεο νυκτὸς ἐ[ν ὧ]ρῃ.
 εἴτα λέγε μελετῶν [τοῦ]το· ἐηῖεῖηϊω[. .]ῖαωιῆυη
 20 ἴα ἴαω ἴαω η [. .]ουω. εἴτα πρὸς κατὰ[δυσ]ιν ἡλίου ἐξαιτοῦ πάλιν·
 κλυθί μευ, ἀργυρό[τοξ]ε, ὃς Χρύσῃν ἀμφιβέ[βηκ]ας (30)
 Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην [Τε]νέδοιό τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις,
 χρυσοφαῖ, λαῖλ[α]ψ καὶ Πυθολέτα μεσεγκριφι,
 Λατῶε σιαωθ Σ[αβ]αῶθ, Μελιοῦχε, τύραννε,
 25 πευχρη, νυκτε[ρόφ]οιτε σεσεγγενβαρφαραγ[γ]ης
 καὶ αρβεθω πολύμορφε, φιλαίματε, ἀρβαθιάω, (35)
 Σμινθεῦ, εἴ ποτ[έ τ]οι χαρίεντ' ἐπὶ βωμὸν ἔρεψα,
 ἦ εἰ δὴ ποτέ τοι κ[ατ]ὰ πίονα μηρί' ἔκηα
 ταύρων ἡδ' α[ιγ]ῶν, τότε μοι κρήνην ἐέλδωρ.
 30 ὁμοίως καὶ πρὸς Σελήνην ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ σύστασις ἥδε·
 δάφνη, μαντο[σ]ῶνης ἱερὸν φυτὸν Ἀπόλλωνος, (40)
 Δάφνη παρθε[νι]κῇ, Δάφνη, Φοῖβοιο ἐταίρη, Σαβαῶθ, ἰαωαω
 ἰαγχωθιπυλα μουσιάρχα οτονυπον,
 δεῦρό μοι, ἔρχε[ο θ]ᾶσσον, ἐπείγομαι ἀείσασθαι
 35 θεσμοὺς θεσπ[εσί]ους, νυκτὶ δ' ἐνὶ δνοφερῇ.

1 Ἀπόλλωνος, Pr 4 σκῆπτρ]ον ἑαῖς, Pr 5 ἐν κορυφ]ῇσι
 πολυπτύχου, Pr 6 ἐοῖς, Pr 7 μεγα]λόστονος, Pr (hymns) 9
 ἰε]μένω, Pr 10 δάφνης θαλ]λὸν ἐμαῖς, Pr 12 σαφηνισι, P;
 α]ἰ σαφηνέσι, Pr 14 ἐτ]άζω, Pr 15 δ]αμασά[ν]δρα,
 Pr 16 [ἐπ]ίρροθε, Pr 20 παλῖ, P 26 αρβεθ ωπολλορφε,
 Pr; αρβεθωπολλορφε, Bortolani; ὦ πολύμορφε, Eitrem; αρβεθω
 πολύμορφε, Pr (hymns); φιλαμαγε, P; φιλαίματε, Eitrem, Pr;
 φιλάρματε, Pr (hymns) 27 After the τοι the line continues with
 the second half of the following verse (κατὰ πίονα μηρί' ἔκηα); the
 scribe, realizing the mistake, did not delete it, but wrote above the line
 the correction χαρίεντ' ἐπὶ βωμὸν ἔρεψα; ἔρεψα, Pr 29 κρή-
 ηνο[ν], Pr 30 ᾠ for Σελήνην, P 33 οψονυπον, Bortolani 34
 ἐπειγομαι, P; ἐπειγέ μοι, Pr

HYMN TO APOLLO

Translation

- Daphne-laurel, sacred plant of Apollo's divination,
 ... (with whose) branches Phoebus wreathed
 ... (his) head with beautiful long hair
 ... shaking in his hands
 5 ... of the ... with many valleys, lofty
 ... prophesy to mortals
 ... grievous ... Apollo himself
 ... O wondrous maiden
 ... with sacred rhythms
 10 ... with a branch in my hands
 ... send me a solemn oracle
 ... prophesying with clear [words]
 ... and so it will be fulfilled
 ... so that I can unveil everything with it
 15 ... mankind's subduer ...

[Lines 21–4]

- O helper through divinations, Phoibos Apollo,
 Leto's son, who dart afar, prophet, come here, here,
 come here, prophesying, give oracles in the night's hour.
 [Then speak, declaiming this:] ΕΕΙΕΙΕΕΙΗΘ ... ΙΑΘΙΕΙΥΕ
 20 ΙΑ ΙΑΘ ΙΑΘ Ε ... ΟΥΘ. [Then at sunset ask again:]
 listen to me, you with the silver bow, who protect Chryses
 and holy Cilla and are the mighty ruler of Tenedos,
 gold-shining, storm and Python slayer, ΜΕΣΕΓΚΡΙΦΗ,
 Leto's son, ΣΙΑΘΗ ΣΑΒΑΘΗ ΜΕΛΙΟΥΧΕ, absolute ruler,
 25 ΠΕΥΧΡΗ, night-wanderer, ΣΕΣΕΓΓΕΝΒΑΡΦΑΡΑΓΓΕΣ
 and ΑΡΒΕΘΗ, with many forms, fond of blood, ΑΡΒΑΘΙΑΘ,
 Smintheus, if I ever roofed a pleasing altar for you,
 or if I ever burnt for you fat thighs
 of bulls or goats, fulfil this desire for me.
 30 [In the same way, there is his (the magician) contact with Selene, as
 follows:]
 Daphne-laurel, sacred plant of Apollo's divination,
 maiden Daphne, Daphne, Phoibos' mistress, ΣΑΒΑΘΗ ΙΑΘΑΘΟ
 ΙΑΓΧΘΗΠΥΛΑ ΜΟΥΣΙΑΡΧΑ ΟΤΟΝΥΠΟΝ,

35 come here to me, come quickly, I urge you to sing
divine laws in the dark night.

COMMENTARY

1 See 7.1. Also at 31.

2–3 See 7.1–2. The reference to the long hair of the god reflects the traditional iconography of Apollo.⁵⁰¹

5 As Preisendanz suggested, probably κορυφῆσι πολυπτύχου, from *Il.* 22.171: here the ‘peaks’ would be those of Mount Parnassus.

7 μεγα]λόστονος: A rare adjective found only in Aeschylus,⁵⁰² which probably refers to Apollo’s heartache for Daphne.

8 δ[ε]ινή: In 30–2 Daphne is identified with Selene and δεινός is frequently found in the hymns to the female lunar/chthonic goddess, where it generally means ‘dreadful’ (see 10.5). However, it could be used here in its meaning ‘wondrous’, alluding to Daphne’s metamorphosis.

9 The ‘sacred rhythms’ are likely to refer to the hymn itself (cf. 1.4, 22, 27, 2.17, 7.4).

10 Laurel branches were standard implements in oracular procedures involving Apollo (see 6.6–8, 7.1–2).

11–12 The feminine participle makes it clear that Daphne-laurel is expected to prophesy instead of Apollo.

13 Homeric hexameter ending, appearing also in the *Homeromanteion* of VII within two Iliadic verses.⁵⁰³

15 δα]μασά[ν]δρα: In VII 696–7 the term appears in the sequence βιασάνδρα δαμασάνδρα καλεσάνδρα κατανικάνδρα (‘man-attacker, man-subduer, man-summoner, man-conqueror’) among the epithets of Artemis-Selene, and in

⁵⁰¹ Lambrinudakis (et al.), *LIMC* ‘Apollon’.

⁵⁰² *Pr.* 413.

⁵⁰³ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.212, 2.257, 9.31, *Od.* 2.187, 16.440; VII 62*, 141. Cf.

Intro. n.74.

IV 2848 (15.42) it is used for Hecate-Selene-Persephone-Artemis: as in lines 30–2, Daphne is identified with the female lunar goddess of the *PGM*.

16–18 See 6.1–3; in spite of the difference in date, the passages are practically identical. Even in this case the night-time fits the dream oracle spell.

19–20 Sequence of vowels in which the magical name Iao and the Apollonian cry ιή can be recognized (see 3.33, 1.5, 7.3).

20–9 Here starts the second section of the hymn, to be recited at sunset as is typical of dream oracles. The passage is basically Homer, *Iliad* 1.37–41 with the insertion of four lines of epithets (lines 23–6) between the first two (lines 21–2) and the last three (lines 27–9) Homeric verses. Chryses, Cilla and Tenedos – centres of the Apollonian cult in the Troad – are not otherwise attested in the *PGM*, while the epithet Smintheus⁵⁰⁴ appears only in III 249.⁵⁰⁵ For κλυθί μευ, see 1.20.

23 χρυσοφαῖ: See 2.23A.

λαῖλ[α]ψ: Since Apollo is not usually connected with storms (see 2.1), λαῖλαψ could be a mistake for the *vox magica* λαλαμ (see 2.22B) – sometimes appearing in the form λαλαμψ⁵⁰⁶ – generally used in solar contexts. On the other hand, an epithet such as ‘storm’, ‘hurricane’, could easily belong to Seth, whose image as a god of storms⁵⁰⁷ is still alive in the *PGM* as testified by his identification with Typhon, the monstrous god of devastating storm winds, and by attributes such as λαλαπετός/λαλαφέτης, ‘storm, hurricane/-sender’.⁵⁰⁸ Here the epithet

⁵⁰⁴ For possible etymologies Graf 2009, 19–21.

⁵⁰⁵ In the hymn to Apollo that will not be analysed in this study owing to its fragmentary condition: see **Intro.** p. 54.

⁵⁰⁶ II 117, XV 15.

⁵⁰⁷ Atmospheric phenomena, as disruptions of the natural order, had always been connected with this god, whose area of competence became in time even more circumscribed to bad weather owing to the intensification of his bellicose nature and to the increasing importance of Amun as god of the sky: Te Velde, *LdÄ* ‘Seth’, 910; Te Velde 1967, especially 23–5, 66–7, 102–6, 109–10, 118, 128–9; Zandee 1963; Meeks 1971, 35–6.

⁵⁰⁸ IV 182, XIII 332.

could have been inserted only as a *vox magica*, and possibly the writer knew the hymn to Seth-Typhon in IV 179–201, where *λαϊλαπετός* and *νυκταστράπτης*, ‘producing nocturnal lightning’, appear together (cf. *νυκτερόφοιτε* at line 25). Alternatively, the epithet could refer specifically to Typhon and, considering its proximity to *Πυθολέτα*, could recall the *Homeric Hymn* to Apollo where the guardian of the Delphic oracle is not Python, but a female dragon described as the nurse of Typhon (possibly identified with Python himself).⁵⁰⁹

Πυθολέτα: A *hapax* in line with the Apollonian myth according to which the god killed Python, the monstrous serpent guarding the Delphi oracle.⁵¹⁰

μεσεγκριφι: Sometimes in the form *μεσενκριφι*, or *μεσιντριφι*, this *vox magica* comes from the Egyptian, and certainly starts with *ms-m/n*, ‘child in/of’, while for its second part different interpretations have been suggested.⁵¹¹

24 Λατῶε: See 6.2.

σιαωθ: Unexplained *vox magica* formed either with the feminine plural ending of Hebrew and other Semitic languages (–ōth), or with the Egyptian ending of *nisbe* formations of feminine nouns.⁵¹²

Σ[αβ]αώθ: Also at 41, see 3.22.

Μελιούχε: Various interpretations have been suggested for this magical name but none is totally satisfying. III 45–6 invokes the ‘mother of all men, you who have brought together the limbs of Meliouchos’, which could allude to the myth of Isis reassembling the scattered limbs of Osiris and suggested an

⁵⁰⁹ *HH* 3.300–60; see Fontenrose 1959, especially 77–93.

⁵¹⁰ Fontenrose 1978, 201–3; Fontenrose 1959. Cf. III 235 for a similar epithet in the fragmentary hymn to Apollo (cf. **Intro.** p. 54).

⁵¹¹ BG; Quack 2004, 443; cf. III 561, IV 2200–1, XXXVI 220.

⁵¹² Frequently attested in e.g. Osing 1998, e.g. 281, cf. 194. On *nisbes*, adjectives derived from a noun or a preposition, see e.g. Allen 2000, 6.1, 8.6.

etymology from μέλος, ‘limb, corpse’/μελίζω, ‘dismember’ + ἔχω instead of μέλι + ἔχω, ‘honeyed’.⁵¹³

τύραννε: Though more often used for human rulers, it can also be found as a divine epithet of various gods: e.g. Ares, Zeus, Apollo, Eros.⁵¹⁴ As it can be used both for a general (Zeus) and a specialized (Eros) hegemony, it does not seem to imply any specific religious conception.⁵¹⁵

25 νυκτε[ρόφ]οιτε: Though the epithet could hint at the Egyptian nocturnal journey of the sun, it is a rare compound always attested as an epithet of female deities (Artemis, Hecate-Selene) which alludes to their lunar nature.⁵¹⁶ It resembles other epithets of Hecate in the *PGM* such as νυκτοφάνεια, ‘who shines in the night’, νυκταιροδύτειρα, ‘who rises and sets at night’, and νυκτιβόη, ‘who screams at night’.⁵¹⁷ Like λαῖλαψ and σιαωθ, it seems to have been inserted here only as a *vox magica* with possible reference to the night-time in which the dream oracle is supposed to take place.

σεσεγγενβαρφαραγ(γ)ης: See 3.20, 26.

26 αρβεθω: Possibly deriving, like ἀρβαθιάω, from the Hebrew *arba’ōth*, meaning ‘four letters’ (plus Iao): ‘Yahweh whose name is written with four letters’. Alternatively, it has been suggested it might come from the Egyptian *Hr bik*, like ιαρβαθ = αρβαιηθ, meaning ‘Horus the falcon’.⁵¹⁸

πολύμορφε: The papyrus has πολλομορφε which, if read together with the final ω of αρβεθω, could contain traces of Ὀπόλλων, crasis for ὁ Ἀπόλλων. It seems the scribe was confused by the sequence ωπολ and thought the name of Apollo was mentioned again but, considering the following

⁵¹³ BG; cf. III 99, V 5.

⁵¹⁴ E.g. *HH* 8.5; Aesch. *Pr.* 222, 736; Soph. *Tr.* 217; Eur. *Hipp.* 538; Aristoph. *Nu.* 564; Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 691.1; cf. IV 2602, 2664 (13.21).

⁵¹⁵ Cf. Müller 1961, 19–21 for various Egyptian equivalents.

⁵¹⁶ *OH* 36.6; Hippol. *Refut.* 4.35.5.2.

⁵¹⁷ IV 2525, 2819–20 (12.2, 15.23), 2546 (12.21), 2808 (15.16).

⁵¹⁸ Perdrizet 1928, 77–8; Fauth 1983; Mastrocinque 2003, 108. Cf. *LGG* II.758–61 (*bik*).

ορφε, an original πολύμορφε seems almost certain. Again, the epithet πολύμορφος is typical of female lunar deities, as it describes their ability to manifest themselves in the different phases of the moon.⁵¹⁹ It is rarely found in connection with male deities, either referring to a specific attribute⁵²⁰ or used as a synonym of πολυώνυμος, ‘with many names’.⁵²¹ Here the epithet could have been drawn from a lunar context together with νυκτερόφοιτε, and added only as *vox magica*. On the other hand, a connection with a male solar god can be found in the Egyptian tradition since every god can have different manifestations, especially solar-creator gods: the different stages of the sun’s journey were conceived as different aspects of a single deity and the cosmic god was ‘the one who made himself into millions’ in the creative process.⁵²² Not surprisingly, one of the commonest epithets of Egyptian supreme deities is *ḥꜥ-ḥꜣwꜣ*, ‘many of forms’, ‘with many forms’.⁵²³

φιλαίματε: If we do not accept the correction φιλάρματε, ‘lover of chariots’, φιλαίματος is a rare epithet of Ares or Phobus, his son, in clear connection with warfare.⁵²⁴ In the *PGM* the bloodthirsty goddess is generally Hecate-Selene: we find accusations such as ‘you killed a man and drank his blood . . . you drank sea-falcon’s blood’, or she is described as

⁵¹⁹ E.g. IV 2726 (14.9), 2799 (15.9), VII 784; Luc. *Philops.* 14.25; Hippol. *Refut.* 4.35.5-7.

⁵²⁰ E.g. Luc. *DDeor.* 20.1.4 (Eros made Zeus πολύμορφος as the god underwent many metamorphoses to fulfil his love designs); Maxim. *Dialex.* 1.1.c3 (Proteus has a πολύμορφος nature as he can change into many forms); *OH* 14.1 (the three-headed, hermaphrodite Protogonus), 29.8, 56.3 (Eubuleus/Dionysus as capable of various metamorphoses in Orphic literature). Cf. Rudhardt 1991, 272-4.

⁵²¹ E.g. Hippol. *Refut.* 5.9.9.1 (different people call Attis by different names); cf. Merkelbach and Stauber 1996, no. 25.2 in an oracle of Apollo Clarius (cf. **Intro.** p. 34). A possible exception to these rules is to be found e.g. in *Vita et sententiae Secundi* 3.1, where the supreme god is πολύμορφος (and πολυώνυμος) without any reference to a specific attribute; similarly, *IGUR* I 176.

⁵²² See **Intro.** pp. 41-4, 46, 51-2, and n.119, n.151; also 4.1, 3.

⁵²³ *LGG* II.220; cf. 4.2, 5, **Intro.** n.119, **I** n.332.

⁵²⁴ Anacr. *Epigr.* 7.226.3; Aesch. *Sept.* 45.

‘blood drinker (αἱμοπότι)’.⁵²⁵ In the hymn to Hecate quoted by Hippolytus, the goddess ‘rejoices at the lethal blood’.⁵²⁶ Even this epithet would thus seem to belong to a lunar context and to have been inserted here only as a *vox magica*.

27–9 A second *hypomnēsis* (see 6.6–8) in line with the traditional structure of Greek hymns. The passage is Homer, *Iliad* 39–41, with the only difference that βωμόν appears here instead of νηόν, ‘if I ever roofed a temple’. Possibly the redactor felt the necessity of substituting ‘a temple’ with ‘an altar’ because he wanted to refer to something he could have actually built for the god considering the private setting of the spells: a small altar could be a ‘domestic’ replacement for a ‘public’ temple. Of course, changing the object, the verb ἐπερέφω, ‘to roof’, ‘to put a cover upon’, hardly makes sense. Alternatively, ἐρεψα could be a mistake for ἔρεξα (mistake because, even if ψ is unclear, ξ does not seem to be possible according to the traces of the letter on the papyrus),⁵²⁷ ‘offer in sacrifice’, and the phrase could thus mean ‘if I ever offered to you a pleasing altar’.

30 Here starts the third section of the hymn, to be addressed to the moon identified with Daphne.

32 Σαβαώθ, ἰωαωο: See 3.22, 1.5.

33 *Voces magicae*, among which can be recognized μούσαρχος, ‘leader of the Muses’, attested as an epithet of Apollo,⁵²⁸ and possibly Ἰακχος, ‘Iacchus’, epithet of Dionysus.

34 δεῦρό μοι: See 4.1, 6.2–3.

ἔρχεο θῆσσον: The same combination is found in Homer, *Odyssey* 16.130.⁵²⁹

34–5 Preisendanz emended ἔπειγέ μοι ἀείσασθαι θεσμούς θεσπ[εσί]ους, ‘hasten to sing divine precepts to me’, but the correction is not strictly necessary since ἐπείγομαι can be

⁵²⁵ IV 2594–8, 2656–60 (13.15–18), 2864 (15.53).

⁵²⁶ Hippol. *Refut.* 4.35.5.4.

⁵²⁷ This reading was suggested to me by W. D. Furley.

⁵²⁸ *Lyrica adesp.* PMG fr. 23.1.2; equivalent to μουσηγέτης: see 7.28.

⁵²⁹ Cf. *AP* 9.474.5.

translated as ‘I urge’ (LSJ III.2) and the object ‘you’ can be implied considering the presence of δεῦρό μοι, ἔρχεο θᾶσσον at the beginning of the line. More interestingly the goddess is supposed to ‘sing’, αἰείσασθαι, the ‘laws, precepts’ which may imply that she is expected to speak in verses, traditional feature of Apollonian oracles.⁵³⁰

δνοφερῆ: Rare adjective found to describe the night in Homer, *Odyssey* 13.269, 15.50 and Hesiod, *Theogony* 107.

CONCLUSIONS

The structure is very similar to **7**: the hymn opens (lines 1–7) by addressing Daphne and – as far as we can tell – recounting part of her myth in narrative style; then there is the *euchē*, first addressed to Daphne (lines 8–15) and then to Apollo (lines 16–18=**6.1–3**); a first rubric breaks the text introducing a new section consisting of an *epiclēsis* (lines 21–6) and followed by a *hypomnēsis* (lines 27–9); a second rubric introduces the final section addressing Daphne-Selene and urging the nymph to come to the magician (lines 31–6). The presence of the rubrics (lines 20 and 30) suggests that we are dealing with at least three different compositions or pieces of compositions.

The hymn, compared with **6** and **7**, is earlier in date and could have been the source of the parallel lines **6.1–3**, **7.1**. However, it looks already like the result of re-elaboration of previous material, even considered in its three single sections. For example, the first ‘hymn’ to Daphne, which somehow serves as a *hypomnēsis* as in **7**, apart from probably containing a line of epithets identifying the nymph with Hecate-Selene (line 15), is attached to a ‘hymn’ to Apollo (lines 16–18). The second section is a Homeric passage into which four lines of epithets (often belonging to Hecate-Selene’s descriptions) have

⁵³⁰ E.g. Fontenrose 1978, 166–95; Amandry 1950, 166–8; Parke 1967, 84; Parke 1985, e.g. 149–70, 221; Johnston 2008, 50–1, 77.

CONCLUSIONS

been pasted. Similarly, some *voces magicae* have been interpolated in the final ‘hymn’ to Daphne-Selene.

Nevertheless, as far as the nature of the deities invoked is concerned, there are no attributes that can surely be ascribed to an Egyptian background. In fact, the only two epithets that might point in this direction (lines 25–6 **νυκτερόφοιτε, πολύμορφε**) are typical of Hecate-Selene and seem to have been inserted only as *voces magicae*. At the same time, the identification of Daphne with Selene as counterpart of the sun god Apollo can be said to be late, but certainly not influenced by Egyptian religious thought, given the Greek specificity of Daphne and the fact that lunar deities in Egypt are male. The hymn does not even show any distinctive solar feature: **χρυσοφαής** (at line 23, the only possible solar epithet) is found within a sequence of *voces magicae* of mixed origin and could have been chosen as a synonym of **Φοῖβος** owing to the ambiguity of its etymology (see 6.1). Therefore, as a whole, the hymn addresses the traditional Apollo and Daphne with a special stress on their prophetic role.

HYMN 9

HYMN TO THE CREATOR GOD: XII 244–52 (SECOND/THIRD CENTURY)⁵³¹

This hymn appears in a spell (XII 201–69) with a bilingual title: in Demotic, *w' gswr*, 'a ring', and in Greek, δακτυλίδιον, 'a little ring'. The procedure explains how to make a magical ring that will help the bearer to succeed in whatever he wishes.

- Preliminaries: The magician has to engrave a stone with an ouroboros snake encircling Helios and Selene and various *voces magicae*. Once consecrated, the stone will be mounted on a golden ring.
- Consecration: The magician prepares a pit in a holy place and, over the pit, an altar, on which various animals are sacrificed. Then he recites the invocation, pouring a libation and holding the stone over the smoke of the burnt offerings.
- Invocation: The performer (identifying himself with different deities) calls the 'gods of the heavens' and 'under the earth' and all sorts of divine entities so that they may assist him because he is about to invoke the 'lord of all'.
- Second invocation: In the first part the magician invokes the 'first father', 'lord of all', describing how all nature is terrified in front of him (passage quoted at 3.29–31); in the second part we find the **hymn**; the conjuration proceeds in prose, recounting how the god controls the harmony of the universe and provides every good thing. In the end, the god is invoked with his different names in different languages and asked to fulfil the consecration so that the ring can be worn.

⁵³¹ For this dating (more precisely after the beginning of the second century and before AD 250) see Dieleman 2005, 41–4.

HYMN TO THE CREATOR GOD

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: MT (Pr reconstructed hymn 1).⁵³²

- Τίς μορφὰς ζώων ἔπλασε(ν); τίς | δ' εὗρε κελεύθους; (245)
 τίς καρπῶν γενέτης; τίς δ' οὖρεα ὑψόσ' ἐγείρει;
 τίς δὲ ἀνέμους ἐκέλευσεν | ἔχειν ἐνιαύσια ἔργα;
 τίς δ' Αἰὼν Αἰ(ῶ)να τρέφων Αἰῶσιν ἀνάσσει;
 5 εἷς θεὸς ἀθάνατος· πάντων | γεννήτωρ σὺ πέφυκας
 καὶ πᾶσιν ψυχὰς σὺ νέμεις καὶ πάντα κρατύνεις,
 Αἰώνων βασιλεῦ καὶ κύριε, ὄν | καὶ τρέμουσιν
 οὖρεα σὺν πεδίοις, πηγῶν ποταμῶν τε ῥέεθρα
 καὶ βῆσσαι | γαίης [κ]αὶ πνεύματα, πάντα τὰ φύντα.
 10 οὐρανὸς ὑψιφαῆς σε τρέμει καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα, |
 κύριε, παντοκράτωρ ἄγιε καὶ δέσποτα πάντων. (250)
 σῇ δυνάμει στοιχεῖα πέλει καὶ φύεθ' ἅπαντα,
 ἡελίου μή(ν)ης τε δρόμος νυκτός τε καὶ ἡοῦς,
 ἀέρι καὶ γαίᾳ καὶ ὕδατι καὶ | πυρὸς ἀτμῷ.

1 δε ευρε, P 2 γεννητης, P; ἔγειρεν, MT 4 τις δε, P 5
 γενέτωρ, MT 7 ὄν τε τρέμουσιν, MT 8 παιδιοις, P; τε τα
 ριθρα, P 9 βηυσσας, P; perhaps not from βῆσσαι -ης, but from
 βύσσα -ης < βυθός -οῦ = depth, abyss 12 δυναμι στυχεια, P;
 φυεται παντα, P 13 μησται, P 14 αερει, P

Translation

- Who moulded the shapes of creatures? Who discovered the paths?
 Who is the begetter of fruits? Who makes the mountains rise
 upwards?
 Who ordered the winds to hold the annual tasks?
 Who is the Aion-eternity who, nourishing Aion-eternity, rules the
 Aions-eternities?
 5 One immortal god. You are by nature the father of everything
 and you dispense the souls to everything and rule everything,
 O king of the Aions-eternities and lord, in front of whom the
 mountains tremble

⁵³² MT, I.164–5 and commentary 16–19. Also Daniel 1991.

HYMN 9

together with the plains, the streams of springs and rivers
and the valleys of earth and the winds, everything that exists.

- 10 The high-shining sky trembles in front of you and every sea,
lord, ruler of all, sacred one and master of all.
Through your power the elements exist and everything comes into
the world,
– the course of the sun and the moon by night and day –
(all the things that are) in the air and on the earth and in the water
and in the steam of fire.

COMMENTARY

1 MT consider the term ζῳα as referring to the stars that form the constellations imagined like living creatures, which would be an idea deriving from Plato and his school.⁵³³ This interpretation was probably supported by the difficulty of finding the sense of the second half of the line. For κελεύθους seems to be incomplete: which paths? The paths of what? Thus, as κέλευθος can be used metaphorically for ‘orbit’ and the noun ζῳον can be used for ‘Zodiacal sign’, the translation could be ‘Who moulded the forms of the beasts (of the Zodiac)? Who found (their) routes?’⁵³⁴ In the second phrase, the necessary personal pronoun referring to ζῳα is missing, but this could be justified by the poetic nature of the text. A striking parallel can be found in the Hermetic treatise *Κόρη κόσμον*, where god moulds the Zodiacal signs that have human form with a mixture of celestial earth and water: ἀνθρωποειδῇ τῶν ζῳῶν διέπλασε.⁵³⁵ However, here the use of the verb πλάσσω is particularly appropriate as in its first meaning it implies ‘to give

⁵³³ Plato, *Ti.* 38e; MT, I.17.

⁵³⁴ As it is in Betz 1992, 163; similarly Calvo Martínez 2003, 234–5. Cf. the similar expression ἐγὼ ἀστρῶν ὁδοὺς ἔδειξα, ‘I showed the paths of the stars’, in the Isiac aretalogies see **Concl.** n.103.

⁵³⁵ *Corp.Herm.* fr. 23.18.7 (Nock and Festugière 1945–54, III.clxxxii–cxciii). Even if the same passage quoted by Stobaeus, 1.49.44.137, has ζῳδίων, which apart from Zodiacal sign can mean drawing, image, but not living creature.

form to a soft substance' such as clay, wax, or earth. To my knowledge, this use of *πλάσσω* for the creation of the Zodiac or of the stars is not otherwise attested in previous literature, but obviously the verb is very common with reference to the creation of living creatures. Prometheus was ordered by Zeus to mould the human beings with clay,⁵³⁶ and the image becomes especially frequent in Judaeo-Christian literature, where we find many instances of *πλάσσω* used for the moulding of men and animals. In the Septuagint, God asks Job ἢ σὺ λαβὼν γῆν πηλὸν ἔπλασας ζῶον, 'didst thou take clay of the ground, and form a living creature?' (see Conclusions below).⁵³⁷ The same idea of god as a moulder was already present in Egyptian tradition, where the god Khnum creates living creatures with clay on a potter's wheel. As often happens, his ability is later given to other creator gods, such as Ptah, who can bear epithets such as *kd/nḥp-rmt-ʿwt-nbt*, 'who moulded all men and animals on the potter's wheel', and Amun who 'moulded the men, livestock, birds, fish and all snakes'.⁵³⁸ Therefore, the first phrase, more than conveying Neoplatonic or Hermetic conceptions on the creation of the Zodiac, would seem to refer to the moulding of living creatures as typical of Greek, Judaeo-Christian and Egyptian traditions.

There remains the problem of *κελεύθους*, not otherwise attested as the object of *εὐρίσκω*. However, a qualification of these 'paths' is not strictly necessary if we turn to Egyptian tradition, where some hymnographical passages describe the

⁵³⁶ E.g. Aesop. *Fab.* 288.1.1; Callim. fr. 493 (Pfeiffer); Ps.-Apollod. 1.45; Luc. *Prom.* 3.9, *DDeor.* 5.1.6.

⁵³⁷ *Jb.* 38.14.1 echoing *Ge.* 2.7. E.g. also Methodius, *Symp.* 3.4.20; Ps.-Just. Mart. *Quaest. et Respons.* 421A.9; Greg. Nyss. *Contra Eunom.* 2.1.402.4; Euseb. *Gener.* 108.15; J. Chrys. *In Genes.* 53.121.42-3.

⁵³⁸ *LGG* VII.228 (*kd-rmt*, Funktion A.b), IV.280 (*nḥp-rmt-ʿwt-nbt* and the immediately following epithets); Hibis, Klotz 2006 IV.15-16. Sandman-Holmberg 1946, 45-9.

supreme god as ‘the one who shows the paths’: Amun, for example, is the one who ‘made everyone know the path to follow (walk)’, and ‘leads human beings on their paths’.⁵³⁹ In papyrus Chester Beatty IV, Amun is asked: ‘Are you not great and mighty? ... Are you not the leader on all ways?’⁵⁴⁰ Usually, this image is connected with the light emanating from the god: the light makes the world inhabitable and allows human beings to distinguish themselves from one another and to go ‘on all ways’.⁵⁴¹ Now, it is true that ‘discovering the paths’ is not the same as ‘showing them’ or ‘leading people on them’, and that the verb εὐρίσκω in relation to gods in Greek literature is often used in the sense of ‘to invent something’, ‘to be the founder of something’. However, as the underlying conception is that the solar god makes the paths visible, the idea of ‘discovering’ is not so far from these Egyptian passages: without the god’s light men would not have any path to walk.

2 τίς καρπῶν γενέτης: In Greek tradition the female earth goddesses are usually responsible for the production of καρποί (‘produce of fields and trees’); these are mainly Demeter and Core-Persephone, who are often said to be καρποφόροι, ‘fruit-bearing’.⁵⁴² In Isidorus’ *Hymns*, Isis is the one who has the ability of discovering and bringing fruits to men thanks to her identification with Renenutet (the Egyptian goddess of harvest) and with Demeter.⁵⁴³ Interestingly, in the second of Isidorus’ *Hymns* Isis is said to be ζωῆς καὶ καρπῶν εὐρέτρια, ‘inventor/discoverer of life and fruits’: the discovery of life is paired with

⁵³⁹ P. Leiden I 350, IV.8, V.20–1.

⁵⁴⁰ P. Chester Beatty IV rto 3.7.

⁵⁴¹ Assmann 1995, 76–7. See also P. Oxy. 4468.20 and commentary *ad loc.*

⁵⁴² Adler, *RE* ‘Karpophoros’.

⁵⁴³ Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.8, 12, 2.3, 19, 3.14, 15 (Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.*); Bernand 1969, 631, no. 175, *ad* 1.8; already in Hdt. 2.59.6, 2.156.21. On the connection between Isis and the harvest cf. *RICIS* 202/1801.161–4: see Dousa 2002, 152–6; Kockelmann 2008, 61–3; Quack 2003, 344.

the discovery of fruits, which could reinforce the interpretation of ζῷα as living creatures at line 1.

In association with male deities, the phrase could recall the creation of plants and fruit-trees in Genesis 1.11–12,⁵⁴⁴ but also the Egyptian epithet *km3-ht-n-‘nh*, ‘who creates the “wood of life”’, an expression used for any kind of vegetal nourishment, especially grain,⁵⁴⁵ found with various deities, including Amun. He can be the one ‘who creates what is useful for his creatures, lord of pasture who makes the “wood of life” grow’, or ‘he made flourish for them whatever lives in their lands (livestock), through the “wood of life” that comes forth from him’.⁵⁴⁶

τῖς δ’ οὐρεα ὑπόσ’ ἐγείρει: As mentioned at 4.5–9, the mountains often appear in standard Egyptian epithets describing what has been created by the supreme god, such as *km3-pt-t3-(dw3t)-mw-dwre*, ‘who creates the sky, the earth, (the Nether-world), the water and the mountains’. Moreover, it is possible to find hymnographical passages describing the creator god as the one who ‘raises’ the mountains: for example, Ptah is the one ‘who rose upwards the earth for me (Re)’, and Re is ‘the unique god who came into being at the beginning . . . who created the Nun and caused the inundation, who made the waters and made live what was in them, who raised the mountains and gave life to men and cattle’.⁵⁴⁷ This stress on mountains within creation probably originated from the importance of the so-called primeval mound in Egyptian cosmogony. Thanks to the observation of the natural phenomenon of the inundation of the Nile, it was thought that the first

⁵⁴⁴ ‘Let the earth bring forth the herb of grass bearing seed according to its kind and according to its likeness, and the fruit-tree bearing fruit whose seed is in it, according to its kind on the earth, and it was so.’

⁵⁴⁵ *Wb* III.342.2–3; *LGG* VII.200; e.g. P. Cairo 58038, I.1.6–7; cf. Assmann 2001a, 57–8.

⁵⁴⁶ Assmann 1983, no. 67; Hibis, Klotz 2006, IV.17.

⁵⁴⁷ P. Berlin 3048, X.4; *BoD* 15, 6–10, papyrus of Hunefer (BM EA 9901) in Carrier 2009. In Greek aretalogies Isis can be the one who raised the mountains, e.g. *RICIS* 202/1801, 160–2; Peek 1930, 70–3.

place of creation was a mound which had emerged from the primordial ocean (on which the various solar gods appear). This mound was also personified by the god Tatenen, whose name *t3-tnm* means exactly ‘raised land’.⁵⁴⁸

3 MT note that ‘annual winds’ do not exist in Europe but they do in Egypt; thus the phrase should have originated in that geographical setting. The association of Amun with the wind, whether as ‘creator’ or ‘giver’ of the winds or ‘wind’ himself, has been analysed in **2.1**, **4.1**, **3**, but it may be worthwhile to mention some other Egyptian hymnographical passages where the god is also described as the one who ‘controls’ the winds. For example ‘the north wind blows upstream at the command of this exalted god’; ‘you are Amun, you are Shu (god of the wind) . . . you are “Sacred of manifestations” as the four winds of heaven, so [you] are called, when they come forth from the mouth of his majesty, the Ba of Shu, who bends the winds’, and ‘just as the north wind goes south, so does the south wind go north, [likewise] the west and east winds, from within him, just as the storms have their days, so are the stars upon their circuits, through the decree of this noble god’. This last example is especially interesting considering that the last lines of our hymn (lines 12–13) mention the sun and the moon as created and moved by the supreme deity.⁵⁴⁹

4 As in **1.15**, it does not seem that this is the Hellenistic god Aion, but that αἰών is used for a personified ‘eternity’ since, if Aion was the god’s name, asking ‘who is Aion?’ would not make any sense as the answer would already be there. Again, the phrase is saying that the deity ‘is’ eternity. In **1.15** we saw that the idea of god ‘being eternal’, or ‘ruling over the eternity(ies)’, has possible parallels both in Judaeo-Christian and Egyptian tradition. Here it is important to add that in

⁵⁴⁸ Schlögl, *LdÄ* ‘Tatenen’. For some important problems in connection with the evolution of this conception see Quack 2011a, 48.

⁵⁴⁹ Esna 387.4, in Sauneron 1968, 268; Sauneron 1962a, 220; Hibis, Klotz 2006, II.23–4, IV.28–9. Cf. De Wit 1957, 33–4.

Egyptian religious thought the supreme deities not only created eternity, but also maintain it: Ptah can ‘come in order to take care of eternity’, and Amun is the one ‘who takes care of the eternity he made’ – which resembles our αἰῶνα τρέφων.⁵⁵⁰ This last example recalls another common epithet, ἱρ-ḏt, ‘who creates eternity’, frequently appearing in the expression nb-nḥḥ-ἱρ-ḏt, ‘lord of everlasting who creates eternity’.⁵⁵¹ If we consider that in poetry the verb τρέφω with an inanimate subject can mean also ‘breed’, ‘produce’,⁵⁵² the last Egyptian epithet could parallel ‘who, breeding/nourishing Aion, rules the Aions?’ in our hymn.⁵⁵³

5 εἷς θεὸς ἀθάνατος: In MT, this phrase alone would demonstrate that the hymn expresses a monotheistic religious thought, so that, wanting to identify which god the hymn is addressed to, we should start looking among the monotheistic religions of the period. Of course the expression εἷς θεός can represent a monotheistic faith and as such is frequently attested especially in Christian literature.⁵⁵⁴ However, defining a supreme god as ‘unique’, ‘one’ (*w*), is very common in Egyptian hymnography too, especially Amun-Re (also *w* ‘*w*’, ‘very unique’, *nṯr-w* ‘the one god’, and many other epithets).⁵⁵⁵ In the New Kingdom, with the establishment of the Theban supremacy, the theology of Amun gave more and more importance to this aspect of ‘uniqueness’: being Amun (*ḥmn*) the ‘hidden one’ (*ḥmn*) he could more easily incorporate all the other main

⁵⁵⁰ E.g. P. Berlin 3048, IX.3; CGMC 42237, 3.

⁵⁵¹ LGG I.506 and Funktion C.a, III.667–9 Funktion H.b.

⁵⁵² LSJ II.6, found since Homer and Hesiod, whose influence on these compositions has already been noted.

⁵⁵³ A possible Greek rendering of ἱρ-ḏt would be the compound αἰωνεργέτης appearing as an epithet of Sarapis on the phylactery gold tablet of the Vigna Codini dated to the early second century: Griffiths 1985; Jordan 1985a.

⁵⁵⁴ E.g. NT, 1 Cor. 8.6.1, Ep.Eph. 4.6.1; Clem. Rom. Homil. 2.12.3.2; Acta Jo. 42.7. For more biblical parallels in the whole hymn, Calvo Martínez 2003, 231–40.

⁵⁵⁵ LGG II.280–1, 282–3, cf. (*ḥmn-R*) VIII.84.R.3.

deities. He is ‘the unique one who made himself into millions’ since, though unique, part of his divine essence is present in everything he created.⁵⁵⁶

πάντων γεννήτωρ: Very similar to πατήρ κόσμου (see 1.10, cf. 3.9 κόσμου γενέτωρ), this epithet in connection with male deities is rare in Christian authors, who generally prefer πατήρ,⁵⁵⁷ and its meaning in the *OH* has different shades according to the deities it is applied to: the stars, as determiners of fate, and Pan, as a cosmic god.⁵⁵⁸ The most interesting parallel comes from the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *De mundo*, dated between the first and the second century AD, where first the universe and then the supreme god are called ‘father of everything’.⁵⁵⁹

6 πᾶσιν ψυχὰς σὺ νέμεις: MT notice that the idea of the supreme god assigning all souls would have its origin in Plato’s *Timaeus*,⁵⁶⁰ where the demiurge first creates the soul of the universe and then, with a less perfect mixture, the souls of living creatures to be given to the gods/stars so that they can fulfil the actual creation of mortal beings. The core of this Platonic idea is also recognizable for example in Gnostic⁵⁶¹ and Hermetic literature – an interesting comparison is found in the *Κόρη κόσμου*, where the creation and allotment of souls (ψυχαί/πνεύματα) by the creator god follows a very similar pattern.⁵⁶² However, the fundamental underlying conception in all these philosophical systems is the dualism between ideal and real, spirit and matter. The myth of the distribution of souls/spirits always describes a hierarchized creation since it both justifies the imperfection of the created world and

⁵⁵⁶ See **Intro.** p. 46; also 4.1, 3; Assmann 2001a, 240–4.

⁵⁵⁷ E.g. Just. Mart. *Apol.* 13.4.3; Greg. Naz. *Carm. moral.* 540.9, *Carm. quae spec.* 1480.6.

⁵⁵⁸ *OH* 7.5, 11.10; cf. 3.2 (Nyx).

⁵⁵⁹ Ps.-Aristot. *De mundo* 397a4, 397b21, 399a30.

⁵⁶⁰ Plato, *Ti.* 30b, 34b–37c, 41c–42e; cf. Procl. *Theol. Plat.* 5.28.22.

⁵⁶¹ See 4.1, 3 (the concept of πνεῦμα substitutes that of ψυχή).

⁵⁶² *Corp. Herm.* fr. 23.14–17; Nock and Festugière 1945–54, see I n.535.

separates the creator from his creation, eliminating any divine responsibility for evil in the world. Our hymn does not show any of these philosophical conceptions, especially since the creation of the astral bodies and of other ‘more terrestrial’ elements such as ‘fruits’ and ‘mountains’ are equally included in the praise of the creator. Therefore, though an echo is certainly possible, a specific philosophical reference would seem a little contrived or out of context.

On the other hand, the ‘distribution of souls’ in our hymn clearly describes the life-giving activity of the god: he creates everything (πάντων γεννήτωρ), he endows everything – or more probably ‘everyone’ – with a soul/life (πᾶσιν ψυχὰς σὺ νέμεις), and keeps ruling over his creation (πάντα κρατύνεις). Given that νέμω does not imply perforce the idea of a hierarchized distribution but could simply mean ‘to give to everybody’, and that the original meaning of ψυχή is ‘life’, ‘breath of life’ (from ψύχω, ‘to blow, breathe’), the phrase could tell us that the god gives life to everything without any further philosophical implications. Similarly, the passage immediately preceding the hymn (quoted at 3.29–31) invokes the ‘ruler of all, who has breathed spirits (πνεύματα) into men for life’ (see also 4.1, 3, 5.4).

πάντα κρατύνεις: Semantically equivalent to the compound παντοκράτωρ (see 3.21, also 2.10, δέσποτα κόσμου, and here line 11).⁵⁶³

7 Αἰώνων βασιλεῦ: See line 4.

κύριε: Also at 11, see 1.2.

7–10 For the god inspiring awe in the whole cosmos see 1.10, 3.1–8, 29–31. A few further Egyptian parallels, with specific reference to the sky, the sea and the mountains, can be added: ‘he makes the sky rage, and he stirs up the sea’ (Amun); ‘the Two Lands quiver, the Great-Blue-Green is drunk, the two mountains roar so much fear he inspires, he provoked

⁵⁶³ Cf. *OH* 3.11 (Ananke).

agitation in the sky, he turned the earth upside down' (Montu).⁵⁶⁴

ποταμῶν τε ῥέεθρα:⁵⁶⁵ Cf. the Homeric ποταμοῖο ῥέεθρα.⁵⁶⁶

11 κύριε παντοκράτωρ: See 1.2, 3.21.

ἄγιε: Apart from the *PGM*, ἄγιος is almost exclusively found, especially in the vocative, in Judaeo-Christian literature as an epithet of God or Christ (cf. 4.1, 3).⁵⁶⁷

δέσποτα πάντων: See 1.3 and 2.10 δέσποτα κόσμου.

12–14 See 2.5, 4.2, 5, 5–9.

σῇ δυνάμει: See 1.34.

CONCLUSIONS

This hymn somehow departs from the conventional structural subdivision since, apart from the unusual interrogative pattern, it consists only of a *eulogia* praising the past (creative) and the present actions of the god. There is not even one participial phrase, but all the verbs are finite, which gives the composition a strikingly narrative character. MT argue that this hymn was composed in Egypt because of the mention of annual winds (see line 3, though cf. the Greek 'Etesian winds'), and, more precisely, in Alexandria, as the god in question is Aion, and 'Aion war der Gott der Stadt Alexandria'. Moreover, as already mentioned, they suggest that this hymn expresses a monotheistic faith, and thus possible parallels or sources should be searched for either in Jewish or in Persian religious literature. The parallel they provide is the Ushtavaiti

⁵⁶⁴ Hibis, Klotz 2006, II.25–6; Medamud, no. 343, 10. Cf. Isidorus, *Hym.* 4.11–13 for the king described as the lord of a similar list of elements of nature.

⁵⁶⁵ Apoll. Rhod. 1.27; Quintus, 3.639; Orph. *Arg.* 1009.

⁵⁶⁶ Hom. *Il.* 14.245 (Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad loc.*).

⁵⁶⁷ E.g. LXX, 2 *Ma.* 14.36.1, 3 *Ma.* 2.2.2, 2.13.1; *Vita Adam et Evae (Apocalypsis Mosis)* 33.14; NT, *Ev. Jo.* 17.11.3; *Acta Jo.* 77.12; Clem. Al. *Hymnus* 30. Cf. 4.1, 3. Later, in the feminine also for the Virgin Mary (e.g. *Physiologus, red. prima* 1.14; Greg. Thaum. *In amunt.* 10.1148.44, 10.1149.47), but already an epithet of Isis in Isidorus, *Hym.* 3.2.

CONCLUSIONS

Gatha 44, 3–5 in which Zarathustra asks rhetorical questions to the uncreated creator Ahura Mazda:

Who determined the path of sun and stars? Who is it by whom the moon waxes and wanes again? This, O Mazda, and yet more, I am fain to know. This I ask Thee, tell me truly, Ahura. Who so balanced the earth and heavens to keep them apart? Who created the waters and the plants? Who yoked swiftness to winds and clouds? Who is, O Mazda, the creator of Good Thought? This I ask Thee, tell me truly, Ahura. What artist made light and darkness? What artist made sleep and waking? Who made morning, noon and night, that call the enlightened man to his duty?

Since the author of the hymn could not have known the Zoroastrian passage directly, MT conclude that it might have reached Alexandria through the mediation of the Jews of Egypt and their constant cultural exchanges with Jerusalem.

However, the hymn does not actually say that the name of the god is Aion (see lines 4 and 7) and calling a god ‘the one’ does not automatically imply a monotheistic background (line 5). The Gatha has undeniable stylistic similarities with our hymn and of course, dealing with another supreme-creator god, some attributes are identical: the creation of plants/fruits, of winds, of the course of the sun and moon (though expressed in different terms) and possibly the creation of stars (see line 1). However, many others are not even mentioned: the rising of mountains, the assignment of soul/life, the fact that the god is ‘eternity’ or that he rules/nourishes/creates eternity, the creation of the elements, the awe/fear inspired by the god in the cosmos and the dominion exerted by the god over his creation (see line 6 *πάντα κρατύνεις*, and 11) – possibly also the creation of living creatures, depending on the interpretation, see line 1.

If the hymn has to have a monotheistic background, a Jewish one seems much more probable, not only because, generally speaking, all the attributes and actions described could fit the Jewish God, but also because the language employed very often belongs to Judaeo-Christian literature (e.g. lines 4, 5 *εἷς θεός*,

HYMN 9

7, 11) – to be especially noted is the use of *παῖς* instead of *κόσμος* (lines 5, 6, 11, see 1.10 *πάτερ κόσμοιο*). In fact, MT also quote a passage from the Septuagint as a conceptual parallel to our hymn (*Ps.* 135.4–9).⁵⁶⁸ The more interesting examples, though, are only mentioned by MT: they show similarities not only in contents but also in stylistic pattern.

Job 34.13

And who is he that made the whole world under heaven, and all things therein?

Job 38

(The Lord is asking Job rhetorical questions)

- 4–5 Where wast thou when I founded the earth? ... Who set the measures of it, if thou knowest?
- 7 When the stars were made, all my angels praised me with a loud voice ...
- 14 Or didst thou take clay of the ground, and form a living creature ...?
- 17 And do the gates of death open to thee for fear and did the porters of hell quake when they saw thee?
- 25–8 And who prepared a course for the violent rain, and a way for the thunders ... so as to feed the untrodden and uninhabited land, and cause it to send forth a crop of green herbs? Who is the rain's father?
- 33–4 And knowest thou the changes of heaven, or the events which take place together under heaven? And wilt thou call a cloud with thy voice, and will it obey thee with a violent shower of much rain?
- 39–40 And wilt thou hunt a prey for the lions? And satisfy the desires of the serpents? For they fear in their lairs, and lying in wait couch in the woods.

⁵⁶⁸ Not so relevant in my opinion since it deals only with the creation of the heavens, 'the earth on the waters', and the 'great lights' (sun, moon and stars).

CONCLUSIONS

It also has to be stressed that the god invoked by our hymn does not have any solar or cosmic features: another element that, together with the narrative style,⁵⁶⁹ points towards a Jewish background. However, we saw in the commentary that all the attributes of the god could fit the theology of Amun-Re too, and for some of them there are good possibilities of an Egyptian origin (lines 2 τίς δ' οὔρεα ὑψόσ' ἐγείρει, 3-4, 7-10 and possibly 1). At the same time, the interrogative-style pattern is not exclusive to Zarathustrian or Jewish texts. For example, in Isidorus' *Hymn* 4 it is used to introduce the story of the founder of the temple of Isis at Medinet Madi, the divinized king of the XII Dynasty, Amenemhat III: τίς τόδε ἄγνὸν ἔδειψ' ἱερὸν Ἑρμοῦθι μεγίστη; / ποῖος θεὸς ἐμνήσθη πανιεροῦ μακάρων;, 'who built this holy temple to greatest Hermouthis? What god remembered the All-Holy One of the Immortals?'; and again, καὶ τίς τόδ' ἔθηκε / κοίρανος ἢ βασιλεὺς ἢ τίς ἀθανάτων;, 'what ruler, what king, or who of the Immortals, determined it?'⁵⁷⁰ As in our hymn, the poet answers these questions himself throughout the rest of the composition. Other examples are papyrus Chester Beatty IV (mentioned in line 1), where Amun is asked: 'Are you not great and mighty? ... Are you not the leader on all ways?'⁵⁷¹ and especially P. Insinger, instruction 24, 31.20-4-32.1-5.⁵⁷²

How do the sun and the moon go and come in the sky? Whence go and come water, fire and wind? Through whom do amulets and spells become remedies? The hidden work of the god, he makes it known on the earth daily. He created light and darkness with every creature in it. He created the earth begetting millions ... he created food before those who are alive, the wonder of the fields. He created the constellation of those that are in the sky ...

⁵⁶⁹ The creational events are fixed in the past (aorist) in contrast with the actions that the god performs continuously (present).

⁵⁷⁰ 4.1-2, 29-30, Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.*

⁵⁷¹ Rto 3.7.

⁵⁷² Lichtheim 1983, 230, cf. 107-234. See Schneider 1991, especially 113-14, 119-24, comparing the instruction with Job 38.

HYMN 9

In conclusion, the hymn or rather its source may have originated in a Jewish milieu, but, again (cf. especially **1**, **2**), it could have been interpreted in the light of the Egyptian tradition too. That this was the case seems to be confirmed by its position within the spell, since it immediately follows XII 238–44, the section rich in Egyptian elements analysed at **3.29–31**. Some details could have been adjusted or added in the light of an *interpretatio aegyptiaca*.

PART II

HYMNS TO THE FEMALE
CHTHONIC/LUNAR DEITY

HYMN 10

HYMN TO HECATE-PERSEPHONE AND HER FOLLOWERS: IV 1399–434 (FOURTH CENTURY)

This hymn is part of an ἀγωγή ἐπὶ ἡρώων ἢ μονομάχων ἢ βιαίων, ‘love spell of attraction in the presence of heroes or gladiators or those who died violently’ (IV 1390–495).

- Rite: The magician goes where heroes, gladiators and others were killed, he says a spell over seven pieces of bread – saved from his own meal – and throws them away; then, he collects some dirt from the place of the ritual and throws it into the house of the woman he wants to attract.
- Invocation (to be said over the pieces of bread): The **hymn** is addressed both to various malignant entities and to the goddess so that they torment the victim until she does whatever the magician wants.
- Compulsive procedure: If nothing happens, the magician should repeat the ritual adding an offering and a different invocation.
- Second invocation: Many chthonic gods and personified concepts are invoked together with Isis and Zeus so that they may send phantoms to torment and attract the specified woman (there are traces of verse but, even if Preisendanz reconstructed his hymns 26 and 27 from this passage, his attempt remains tentative since this invocation is mainly prosaic).

Often clumsy iambic trimeters. Guide edition: Pr (also reconstructed hymn 25).

Μοίραις, Ἀνάγκαις, | Βασκοσύναις, Λοιμῶ, Φθόνῳ (1400)
καὶ φθιμμένοις ἄωροις, βιομόροις πέμπω τροφάς·

- τρικάρανε, νυχία, βορβοροφόρβα, | παρθένε,
 κλειδοῦχε Περσέφασσα, | Ταρτάρου Κόρη,
 5 γοργῶπι, δεινή, πυριδρακοντόζωνε παῖ· (1405)
 ὁ δεῖνα ἐκ τῆς τροφῆς | ἑαυτοῦ καταλείψανα (1405a)
 δάκρυσιν ἔμειξεν | καὶ στενάγμασιν πικροῖς,
 ὅπως αὐτὸν | καρπίσῃσθε βασάνοις ἐχόμενον, |
 ἦρωες ἀτυχεῖς, οἱ ἐν τῷ δεῖνα τόπῳ
 10 συνῆχεσθε, λειψίφωτες ἀλλοιομόροι, | (1410)
 τὸν δεῖνα καρπίσασθε τὸν πονοῦν|τα καρδίαν,
 ἔνεκεν τῆς δεῖνα, τῆς ἀσεβοῦς | καὶ ἀνοσίας·
 ἄξατε οὖν αὐτὴν βασανιζομένην, διὰ τάχους
 εἰουτ ἀβαώθ, | ψακερβα, ἀρβαθιάω, λαλαοῖθ, |
 ἰωσαχωτου, (1415)
 15 ἀλλαλεθω, καὶ σύ, κυρία | βορβοροφόρβα, συνατρακαβί
 βαυ|βαραβας ενφνουν, μορκα, Ἐρεσχιγὰ(λ) |
 νεβουτοσουαλήθ,
 πέμψον δὲ Ἑρινύν, | ὀργογοργονιοτριαν,
 ψυχὰς καμόν|των ἐξεγείρουσαν πυρί, (1420)
 ἦρωες ἀτυχεῖς ἠρωίδες τε δυστυχεῖς
 20 οἱ ἐν τοῦ|τω τῷ τόπῳ, οἱ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ,
 οἱ | ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, οἱ ἐπὶ ταῖς μυρίναις | σοροῖς,
 ἐπακούσατέ μου καὶ ἐξεγείρατε (1425)
 τὴν δεῖνα ἐν {τῇ} νυκτὶ ταύτῃ καὶ ἀφέλεσθε αὐτῆς
 τὸν ἡδὺν ὕπνον ἀπὸ τῶν | βλεφάρων καὶ δότε
 25 αὐτῇ στυγεράν μέριμναν, φοβεράν (τὴν) λύπην
 καὶ (τὴν) μεταζήτησιν τῶν ἐμῶν τύπων
 καὶ (τὴν) θέλησιν τῶν ἐμῶν θελημάτων, (1430)
 ἄχρισ | ἂν ποιήσῃ τὰ ἐπιτασσόμενα αὐτῇ | ὑπ' ἐμοῦ·
 κυρία Ἐκάτη φορβα φορβω|βαρ βαρω φωρφωρ φωρβαῖ, |
 30 εἰνοδία, κύων μέλαινα.

6 Ἀ for δεῖνα, throughout the hymn 7 τραχυσιν, P 10
 λιψιφωτες αλλοιομοροι {ατυχεις}, P (ατυχεις drawn from the
 preceding line) 11 καρπισασθαι, P 16 Ἐρεσχιγὰ[λ], Pr 19
 δε, P 21 μυρινοισ σοραισ (above α the correction ο), P; μυρίναις, Pr;

COMMENTARY

μυρσίνας, Pr (hymns) 23 {τῆ}, Pr (hymns); ἀφελεσθαι, P 25,
26, 27 <τῆν>, Pr (hymns) 28 ἐπιτασσομένη, P

Translation

To Moirai, Necessities, Malignities, Plague, Envy,
to those who died untimely and violently, I send food.
O three-headed, nocturnal, who feed on mud, maiden,
key-holder Persephassa, Core of Tartarus,
5 terrifying-eyed, dreadful, child wreathed with serpents of fire;
he, NN, mixed leftovers from his own food
with tears and bitter moans,
so that you may release him from the torments he is suffering,
you unlucky heroes who are confined in the NN place,
10 unfortunate who left the light,
release him as he is suffering in his heart
because of her, NN, who is impious and sacrilegious.
So, bring her here subjected to tortures, quickly
EIOUT ABAÖTH PSAKERBA ARBATHIAÖ LALAOITH IÖSACHÖTOU
15 ALLALETHÖ and you, mistress who feed on mud, SUNATRAKABI
BAUBARABAS ENPHNOUN MORKA ERESCHIGAL NEBOUTOSOUALĒTH,
send the Erinyes ORGOGORGONIOTRIAN
who awakens with fire the souls of the dead;
unlucky heroes, unfortunate heroines,
20 who in this place, who in this day,
who in this hour, who on oil-scented coffins,
listen to me and awake
her, NN, tonight, and take away
the sweet sleep from her eyelids and give
25 her hateful anxiety and dreadful pain,
make her search for my traces,
and desire what I desire,
until she does what I order her.
O mistress Hecate PHORBA PHORBÖBAR BARÖ PHÖRPHÖR
PHÖRBAI,
30 guardian of the roads, black bitch.

COMMENTARY

1 Μοίραις, Ἀνάγκαις: The Moirai already appeared in 1.30–1, but here their negative aspect of ‘Fates of death’ seems to be more prominent. In Greek literature they can be mentioned together with Ananke, the personified goddess of inevitability to whom even the gods are subjected, who is sometimes said to be their mother.¹ The plural personified entities ‘Necessities’ are not otherwise attested,² nor the plural **Βασκοσύναις**, ‘Malignities’. Probably the two terms were coined following the example of the ‘plural’ Moirai and the three groups were addressed together thanks to the importance of triplicity in Hecate’s hymns (see line 3). We could also hypothesize that ‘Necessities’ and ‘Malignities’ were conceived as three like the Moirai.

Βασκοσύναις: Invocations to ‘malignity’, ‘evil eye’, are not attested outside this spell,³ since, even in the *PGM*, **βασκοσύνη/βασκανία** is usually something one has to protect oneself against.⁴ An instance of personification is found in Callimachus, but in the singular and outside an invocational pattern.⁵ A certain continuity is shown by pairing ‘malignity’ with **φθόνος**, ‘envy’,⁶ which is very frequent – they can also be

¹ E.g. Plato, *Resp.* 617c; Plu. *De genio* 591b7, *Quaest. conv.* 745c.10; Wernicke, *RE* ‘Ananke’; Simon, *LIMC* ‘Ananke’.

² Not even in the *PGM*, see IV 1456, 2856; the only similar instance in III 120, **Ἀναγκαίων**, ‘daimons of Necessity’, ‘Necessitators’. See Furley 2010, on Greek hymns addressed to abstract entities, especially Tyche, but also Moira/Moirai, Ananke.

³ IV 1451: a personified **Βασκανία** (singular) appears again in the prose invocation.

⁴ VIII 34; Pr 1974, P 3.4, 9.9. Cf. *Cyranides* 1.7.21, 4.26.4, 4.67.5; *Carm. de vir. GDRK* 64.51, 132, 205.

⁵ Callim. *Aet. fr.* 1.17 (Massimilla 1996, *ad loc*); similarly *SEG* 15.853, 7 **Βασκανίη**.

⁶ E.g. Philo, *De mut.* 112.1, *De somn.* 1.107.3, *De vita Mosis* 1.246.3; Plu. *De cur.* 518c7; D.Chrys. *Or.* 45.5.3; *SEG* 24.1197, c3, see Bernard 1969, 487, V.4.

synonyms – but the use of the plural is unusual and, as in the case of *Ἀνάγκαις*, probably prompted by the proximity of the *Moirai*.

Λοιμῶ: Another uncommon personification, possibly triggered by the assonance with *Λιμός*, the personified demon of ‘hunger’, who appears for example in Hesiod, *Theogony* 227, among the children of Eris, Discord.⁷

Φθόνῳ: Though Phthonus is a widely attested personification of envy and jealousy,⁸ the demon makes only this appearance in the *PGM*.

2 The line refers to the ritual described in the spell: the magician offers part of his own food to the entities he is invoking. This practice recalls the ‘suppers’ of Hecate (*δεῖπνα*): at the time of the new moon, some food was taken to the crossroads and offered to Hecate to avert the possible danger caused by the transition from the old to the new month, and to placate the spirits of the restless dead who were thought to haunt these places under Hecate’s control and to be especially active during this period of transition (see lines 3–5).⁹ Our spell does not mention the new moon or the crossroads, but says that the invocation has to be performed ‘where heroes and gladiators and those who have died a violent death were slain’. In any case, the procedure is not much different from the traditional ‘suppers’ of Hecate: food is offered to propitiate those categories of dead, led by Hecate, who were not allowed to rest in the Underworld, and the offering takes place in a location thought to be haunted by their ghosts.¹⁰

⁷ West 1966, *ad loc.*; on the confusion between *λοιμός* and *λιμός* see also Thuc. *Hist.* 2.54.1–4.

⁸ Williams 1978, *ad Callim. Hym.* 2.105; Bernert, *RE* ‘Phthonos’.

⁹ Smith, ‘Hecate’s suppers’, in Hastings et al. 1908–26; Heckenbach, *RE* ‘Hekate’, 2780–1; Mainoldi 1981, 34–6; Johnston 1990, 26–7; Johnston 1999, 60–1.

¹⁰ As far as the new moon is concerned, the time-setting, though not expressed, could be implied. On this ritual see also Johnston 2002, 351–3.

In Greek tradition, indeed, malevolent demons and ghosts were often believed to be the spirits of ‘special’ deceased – those who had suffered a violent (βαιοθάνατοι) or untimely (ἄωροι) death, or were left unburied (ἄταφοι) – who kept haunting the vicinity of their tombs or liminal places such as crossroads (see lines 3–5).¹¹ On the other hand, in Egyptian tradition, though the ‘angry’ dead could be thought to be the cause of many worldly afflictions, they did not belong to the same strict categories: for example, they could be those who had been dead for a long time and thus no longer received tomb offerings, or executed captives. Moreover, all the transfigured dead were able to move freely from one world to the other (see 1.28) and thus to interfere in human life, also with positive outcomes.¹²

3–5 Since the invocation addresses Hecate directly as the leader of the demonic entities mentioned above, it will be useful to summarize the evolution this goddess underwent in order to become the mistress of chthonic hosts described by the *PGM*.¹³ There has been a long-standing debate about the Anatolian or Greek origin of Hecate. As it lies outside the aim of this study, it will be sufficient to say that the Anatolian origin thesis is now generally accepted and that especially Kraus, one of the main promoters of a Carian origin, maintained that Hecate in her motherland was a form of the Anatolian Earth-Mother Goddess whose functions underwent changes during her ‘importation’ to Greece.¹⁴

The first literary record of Hecate is found in Hesiod, *Theogony* 411–52, where she is said to be the daughter of the Titans

¹¹ Johnston 1990, 34–6, 145–6; Johnston 1995b, especially 363–70; Johnston 1999, 127–60; Ogden 2001, 3–12, 225–6; Martin 2005, 223–8.

¹² Johnston 1999, 90–4; Nordh 1996, 102–3; see I n.137.

¹³ For the following discussion see Johnston 1999, especially 203–49; Johnston 1990, 21–48; Farnell 1896, II.501–19; Heckenbach, *RE* ‘Hekate’; Sarian, *LIMC*, ‘Hekate’; Fauth 2006, 1–25; Zografou 2010.

¹⁴ E.g. Laumonier 1958, 421–5; Kraus 1960, 20–56; Marquardt 1961, 250–9; cf. Berg 1974, who refuses to accept the Carian origin of the goddess; Sarian, *LIMC*, ‘Hekate’, 985.

Perses and Asterie and, being *μουνογενής*, an only child, she reunites in herself the heritage of her ancestors Pontus, Gaea and Uranus. Zeus regards her with such great favour as to allow her to keep the privileges she had among the Titans, which consisted of a portion of honours in the earth, in the sky and in the sea. These characteristics, together with other functions, already depict her in her fundamental role of intermediary between the three regions of the cosmos and between the 'old time' (Titans) and the 'new' (Olympians).¹⁵ Moreover, the goddess receives the epithet *κουροτρόφος*, 'nourisher of youths', which expresses one of her fundamental functions still attested in the *PGM*: to protect during childbirth and childhood.¹⁶

In the *Homeric Hymn* to Demeter, Hecate appears first as the only witness, besides Helios,¹⁷ of Persephone's abduction, then as the companion and helper of Demeter in her search for her daughter, and finally as the escort of Persephone in her descent to and return from the Underworld. She is still *κουροτρόφος* (here in a totally feminine sphere), and her presence during a time of crisis and transition – from life to death, Upper-world to Underworld, virginal to marital status – confirms her role as intermediary between different worlds and realities.¹⁸ However, the Hesiodic 'sea' seems to have been replaced by

¹⁵ Strauss Clay 1984; Walcot 1958, 10–14; Marquardt 1961, 243–50; Boedeker 1983; for Kraus 1960, 58–64, the Hesiodic description of Hecate would still be closer to her original Anatolian nature. Cf. the hymn to the Mother of the gods from Epidauros (*IG* IV².1.131), in which the goddess asks Zeus to have a share of the sky, of the earth and of the sea: Furley and Bremer 2001, 6.2.20–3 and commentary, especially II 174.

¹⁶ Hadzisteliou Price 1978, especially 123, 152, 159, 192.

¹⁷ Their joint appearance seems to imply their complementary nature of solar god and lunar goddess (capable of 'seeing everything', see 1.9), even if the lunar nature of Hecate developed only later – although see e.g. Bacchyl. *Hym.* fr. 2.1 (Irigoin). Of course, her lunar connotations could have been inherent in her triplicity as mediator between the three regions of the cosmos more than in her chthonic aspect.

¹⁸ Richardson 1974, 294–5.

Hades, which gives Hecate her first attested literary connection with the chthonic world. She is described as holding torches in her hands, as in one of her typical iconographies,¹⁹ which symbolizes her role as guide through the dark Underworld's realms exactly as her later epithet *φωσφόρος*, 'light-bearer' (see 12.23). The important role Hecate plays in Persephone's myth puts her in strong connection with the Eleusinian deities and the chthonic world and underlines her funerary function as messenger and guide from and into the Underworld.²⁰

Thanks to her mediating ability, Hecate also exercised an apotropaic function in various liminal places where the images of the goddess were erected: city gates, house thresholds and especially crossroads – together with Hermes.²¹ This last association reinforced her triplicity – already inherent in her authority over the three regions of the cosmos. She obtained the epithet *τριοδίτις*,²² and was identified with the Roman Trivia, goddess of the three-way crossroads. Her connection with liminal places seems one of the main reasons for the

¹⁹ *HH* 2.52. Sarian, *LIMC*, 'Hekate', I.A; Werth 2006, 153–65. For Kraus Hecate would have originally had chthonic traits as an Earth-Mother Goddess.

²⁰ Edwards 1986; Sarian, *LIMC*, 'Hekate', 1013.

²¹ Liminal places were perceived as outside the 'civil' space: they annulled the horizontal space–time continuum to create a vertical one, where communication and crossing between different worlds became possible. For this reason crossroads in particular were a privileged location for the apparition of ghosts and demons, and for the elimination both of discards from purification rituals and of the corpses of those who soiled their hands with foul deeds, such as parricides (e.g. Eupol. *PCG* fr. 132; Harpocration, *Lexicon* 223.12–224.9). See Johnston 1991; Smith, 'Hecate's suppers', in Hastings et al. 1908–26. For examples of Hecate's protection of the *limen* including the images of the triple Hecate – the so-called *Ἑκάταια* – that were erected at crossroads and in front of house doors, and for her epithets *προπυλαία*, *προθυραία* and *ἐνοδία*, see II n.13; Kraus 1960, especially 12–13, 69–70, 91–2, 95–101, 105–12, on the evolution of the *Hekataia* 119–65; Werth 2006; cf. Laumonier 1958, 574–5, 681–2. On Rhea-Cybele in connection with the protection of doors and entrances, Picard 1964.

²² E.g. Cornut. 72.13; *OH* 1.1; Athenaeus, 2.1.151.11, 26; Kruse, *RE* 'Trioditis'; Hopfner, *RE* 'Τριοδος'.

development of her ‘darker’ nature, owing to the principle of the ‘negative will’: exactly as she could guarantee a safe transition, she could also impede it; as she could protect from the dangerous entities haunting the *limina* (see line 2), she could also incite them to attack when she was not adequately appeased.

However, Hecate must have had some other peculiarities, otherwise it would be impossible to explain why Hermes, who shared with her the ability to cross between worlds and thus the function of protector of the *limen*, did not undergo a similar development. In fact, the chthonic Hermes, Hermes psychopomp, never became a leader of ghosts and demons. One possible ‘trigger’ has been recognized in her identification with the not very well-known Thessalian goddess ‘of the roads’ Enodia, who seems to have been linked with the use of drugs and with Thessalian witches.²³ Another hypothesis underlines her strong association with Artemis attested from the fifth century BC onwards.²⁴ The two deities shared important functions and attributes;²⁵ thus it has been hypothesized that, since they could not coexist, Hecate’s competences had to be reconsidered. Some local legends seem to have played an important role during this process. They tell us about young women who, having failed the transition from virginal to maternal status, provoked Artemis’ wrath and were killed by the goddess, or committed suicide, or were saved at the last moment: in the end, they were transformed into statues – or if alive into priestesses – in the temple of Artemis, becoming ἀγάλματα,

²³ Kraus 1960, 77–83; Marquardt 1961, 252; Johnston 1990, 23–4, and footnote 10; cf. Martin 2005, 169–77; cf. the hexameters from Selinous (see **Intro.** pp. 34–5), Jordan and Kotansky 2011 and Faraone and Obbink 2013, Col. i, 13, ‘Hecate Enodia’.

²⁴ E.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 676; Eur. *Ph.* 109–10; Kraus 1960, especially 85–6; Sarian, *LIMC*, ‘Hekate’, 985–6. Cf. Johnston 2011.

²⁵ They both had a tutelary function over feminine transition key moments such as marriage and delivery (e.g. they were both identified with Eileithyia the protectress of childbirth: Pingiatoglou 1981, especially 93, 98–119); they were both described as givers of light or light bearers; the dog was an attribute both of Artemis and of Hecate (see line 30).

‘images’, ‘symbols’, of the goddess. In two cases Artemis makes the young woman ‘become Hecate’.²⁶ As these dead virgins were thought to be able to come back as malevolent ghosts and inflict madness or suicidal tendencies on young women in transitional periods, Johnston suggested that Greek mythical imagery, not being able to accept the superimposition of the competences of Artemis and Hecate, made Hecate shift from ‘protectress of the transition’ to ‘transitional victim’. She would have thus become the prototype of all the vindictive malevolent spirits that used to emerge from these cases of premature death.²⁷

τρίκαρπε: Pausanias attributes the invention of the iconography of the three-bodied Hecate (with three complete juxtaposed bodies) to the sculptor Alcamenes: whether true or not, from the fifth century BC this type became the commonest representation of the goddess.²⁸ As stated above, triplicity was a fundamental characteristic of the Greek Hecate, both as a goddess capable of accessing three realms and as goddess of the crossroads. Furthermore, especially from the Hellenistic period onwards, Hecate starts to be characterized as a lunar goddess.²⁹ This lunar quality could have been already inherent in her triplicity and in her ability to mediate between different worlds – and thus of accessing the Underworld – or Hecate

²⁶ Johnston 1999, 203–49; cf. Berg 1974, 139.

²⁷ Hecate’s role of magician *par excellence* and leader of ghosts is attested in Euripides’ *Medea*, but see also Eur. *Hel.* 569–70, *Ion* 1048; Heckenbach, *RE* ‘Hekate’, especially 2772–7.

²⁸ Paus. 2.30.2.6–7; Chariclides, *PCG* fr. 1: δέσποιν’ Ἑκάτη τριῶδιτι, τρίμορφε, τριπρόσωπε, ‘mistress Hecate goddess of the crossroads, with three forms and three faces’; Kraus 1960, 95–101; Sarian, *LIMC*, ‘Hekate’, II–V, 1015–18; Werth 2006, 35–85. This is also the commonest type on magical gems, even if Hecate’s amulets are quite rare: e.g. DD 189 (no. 252–4 *bis*, 280, 294); Michel 2001, no. 43; Michel 2004, 277–8.

²⁹ An earlier allusion can be found in the *HH* (above) and in Soph. *TrGF* fr. 535, where she is paired with Helios and clearly represents his counterpart. E.g. Plu. *De defect.* 416e1–5; Porph. *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* 8.61.58–65; *Scholia in Aristoph. Pl.* 594. Laumonier 1958, 413–16; Kraus 1960, 87, the lunar traits would have been inherent in the Anatolian Hecate, 102–12.

could have obtained it from her association with Artemis or with ghosts and witches. In any case, even if in origin her triple iconography was almost certainly conceived owing to the apotropaic and liminal functions of the goddess, later sources tend to explain it as embodying the three phases of the moon, which are sometimes identified with the three goddesses Selene, Artemis and Hecate, as they were the three aspects of a single lunar deity.³⁰

Τρικάρανος³¹ is one of her many epithets formed with the number three to be found in magical hymns, where Hecate's identification with Selene seems to stress the lunar derivation of her triplicity. From the iconographical point of view, even the three-bodied Hecate had three heads, thus τρικάρανος does not necessarily imply a reference to a three-headed type – sometimes attested anyway.³² Late sources tell us that Hecate could also be represented with three, or four (see 12.33), animal heads: dog, horse, boar, water-snake and bull (see line 30 and 11.58, 12.23).³³

νυχία: The adjective is attested as an epithet of Hecate whose nocturnal-lunar nature is confirmed by other epithets such as νυκτιπόλος and νυκτέριος.³⁴

³⁰ E.g. Cornut. 72.7–15; Nonn. *Dion.* 44.191–9 (Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad loc.*); *Scholia in Eur. Med.* 397; cf. Cleomedes, 2.5.87–91; *Scholia in Aristoph. Pl.* 594.1–3. Also Athena, Artemis, Hecate: Plu. *De prov.* 8. Cf. Fauth 2006, 27–31.

³¹ Hecate is τρικάρανος in the oracle given by the goddess quoted by Porph. *De philo.* 151.4, who adds that the triplicity of the goddess depends on her control over the elements of water, earth and air (the Hesiodic sea, earth and sky); cf. Kraus 1960, 103–4. Similarly, *SEG* 30.326. As τρικάρανος was typical of Cerberus (Woodford, Spier, *LIMC* 'Kerberos'), it could have shifted onto Hecate also owing to her connection with both the Underworld and dogs (see line 30).

³² Farnell 1986, II.549–57; Sarian, *LIMC* 'Hekate', II.B–C.

³³ Orph. *Arg.* 975–80; J. Lydus, *De mens.* 3.8.14–25 (sixth century).

³⁴ Cornut. 72.17; Luc. *Nec.* 9.19; Apoll. Rhod. 4.1020 (νυκτιπόλος); *OH* 1.5 (νυκτέριος), also 9.6 (Selene), 70.9 (Eumenides/Erinyes, see line 5); for νυκτερόφοιτος see 8.25. Cf. the magical object from the divinatory kit from Pergamon discussed by Morand 2001, 185–8 (pl. 6, 7): a triple lunar goddess with attributes such as a torch (see II n.19, and *passim*), a snake (see line 5), a

βορβοροφάρβα: This compound means ‘who feed on mud/filth’, but meaningless combinations of the syllables βορ/βαρ/βωρ, φωρ/φορ, normally including φορβα, are also found in magical papyri, tablets and gems in connection with Hecate-Selene or Typhon-Seth – also here at lines 15 and 29.³⁵ Therefore, the epithet should probably be included among those *voces* whose *raison d’être* is to produce a particular sound effect through reduplication, in this case possibly the barking of a dog (see line 30).³⁶

παρθένε: Typical epithet of Athena and Artemis, but also found in connection with other deities such as Persephone (even if often superfluous, considering her standard epithet Core), the Erinyes and Hecate.³⁷ The term in itself is generic as it can be applied to any young woman, and in this context it underlines the identification of Hecate with Persephone-Core (see line 4) and with Artemis (see lines 3–5).

4 κλειδοῦχε: Literally ‘key-holder’, also ‘guardian’, ‘protector’, in earlier literature the term is found with various deities since any god can ‘guard’ something depending on the circumstances.³⁸ In the *PGM* it appears only twice: here and in this same spell at IV 1466–7 as an epithet of Anubis in connection with the opening of the gates of the Underworld. Elsewhere Anubis is the one ‘who holds the keys to Hades’, and the key appears among the symbols of Hecate-Selene.³⁹ This association between Hecate and the key is not surprising if we consider her role of protectress of doors and thresholds,

knife (cf. II n.40 and n.94) and a key (see line 4) is called – among other names – NYXH and ΔΙΩNH (see 11.25–44, C Δωδωνή, 14.1). On the subject see also Mastrocinque 2002; Gordon 2002.

³⁵ E.g. IV 2348–52, VII 354–6, 358–60; DD no. 252; Mastrocinque 2003, 112.

³⁶ Jordan 1985b, 240–1, with more examples; Fauth 1993, 65–8.

³⁷ E.g. Soph. *Aj.* 835; Pind. fr. D2.77 (Rutherford 2001a, also 266).

³⁸ E.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 538 (Eros key-holder of Aphrodite’s bedroom); Aristoph. *Th.* 1143 (Athena key-holder of the city of Athens).

³⁹ IV 335–42, 2292–3 (11.49), VII 785, LXX 11, *Suppl.* 46.3, 47.3, 48J.4, 49.11, 57; on Anubis see Morenz 1975.

and of mediator between different realms. At Lagina in Caria they annually celebrated a procession in honour of Hecate called κλειδὸς ἄγωγή, ‘carrying of the key’, possibly aimed at the protection of the city’s access points, and the key appears among Hecate’s attributes on various Hekataia.⁴⁰ In literature, Plutarch used κλειδοῦχος to describe the Moirai as controlling the passage between different cosmic realms,⁴¹ and in the *OH* the epithet is used for Prothyraia, ‘the one in front of the door’, assimilated with Hecate, and for Hecate herself who becomes ‘mistress key-holder of all the cosmos’.⁴² Porphyry collected an oracle by Pan which listed the symbols of Hecate: wax of three colours, a torch, the avenging sword, a serpent coiled around her, the key and the scourge.⁴³ Later on, Proclus, discussing the cosmic significance of the number twelve, reports that, according to Orpheus, Hecate is called κλειδοῦχος as she ‘encloses the boundaries of everything in the cosmos’.⁴⁴ Although in the *PGM* the possession of keys seems to involve only the keys of the Underworld, the epithet shows continuity with Hecate’s traditional role of guardian of the *limen*.

Περσέφασσα, Ταρτάρου Κόρη: The identification of Hecate with Persephone-Core is not particularly surprising if we consider their association in the *Homeric Hymn* to Demeter and the chthonic traits they shared (see lines 3–5). In particular,

⁴⁰ See **II** n.21; Diehl and Cousin 1887, especially 37; Hatzfeld 1920, especially no. 18; Berg 1974, 137; Laumonier 1958, 398–9, 416–19, and 344–425 for the sanctuary and cult of Hecate at Lagina; Johnston 1999, 205–6; Kraus 1960, 41–9, 157: the key, together with the scourge, daggers and snakes, is typical of the representations from Asia Minor and South Balkans. See also Werth 2006, 209–11.

⁴¹ Plu. *De genio* 591b.7.

⁴² *OH* 2.5, 1.7; but other deities can have the keys: Pluto, 18.4, of the earth; Proteus, 25.1, of the sea; Eros, 58.4, of everything; Daimon, 73.6, of happiness and sorrow.

⁴³ Porph. *De philo.* 134.7–136.2.

⁴⁴ See Johnston 1990, 39–48, 146; Johnston 1999, 206; Zografou 2010, 107–9, Köhl, *RE* ‘Kleiduchos’.

it seems to be attested in Orphic literature where Hecate can be the daughter of Demeter.⁴⁵

5 γοργῶπι: Though sometimes an epithet of Athena, the adjective can also be used to describe terrifying creatures with serpentine attributes.⁴⁶ Here it seems to imply a specific allusion to the Gorgons, with whose name it is compound. In many traditions there were three of them and they were often confused with the three snake-haired Erinyes.⁴⁷ It is not certain whether they originally had a chthonic connotation or not – though the serpentine features would seem to point in this direction – but they certainly obtained it through this connection with the Erinyes. Hecate's assimilation with these demons in the *PGM* is testified both by direct identification and by descriptions of the goddess as snake-haired.⁴⁸ Moreover, the association with the Gorgons does not look surprising since the liminal Hecate shared the apotropaic function with the Gorgoneion (see line 3, cf. line 17).⁴⁹ At the same time, the Egyptian Netherworld was populated by countless demonic entities and doorkeepers, many of whom had serpentine forms. Contact with Egyptian tradition could have promoted the assimilation between the various Greek mythological figures with serpentine traits and the Underworld, and, in its turn, with Hecate. Nevertheless, the iconographical

⁴⁵ *Scholia in Apoll. Rhod.* 233.8=Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 400: καὶ τότε δὴ Ἑκάτην Δηὸ τέκεν εὐπατέρειαν, 'and then Demeter generated Hecate, daughter of a noble father'. Possibly already in Eur. *Ion* 1048, Εἰνοδία θυγάτηρ Δάματρος, 'Einodia daughter of Demeter' (see line 30); Plu. *De prov.* 8.4, *De facie* 942d.4–11 (Core-Persephone identified with Selene). Johnston, *NP* 'Hekate'; Fauth 2006, 19–25.

⁴⁶ E.g. Soph. *Aj.* 450, *TrGF* fr. 844.2; Aesch. *Pr.* 356 (Typhon); Eur. *HF* 1266 (snakes), *Or.* 261 (Erinyes).

⁴⁷ E.g. Aesch. *Eu.* 46–8, *Ch.* 1048–9; Paus. 1.28.6.2–4; cf. Aristoph. *Ra.* 470–8. Gorgons and Erinyes are also in their turn associated with other demonic entities: Sarian, *LIMC* 'Erinyes'; Sarian 1986; Werth 2006, 70–6; Junge 1983, especially 77–91.

⁴⁸ Cf. e.g. 15.9, 11–15, 50.

⁴⁹ Krauskopf, *LIMC* 'Gorgo, Gorgones'; Howe 1954; Werth 2006, 201–3.

depictions given by the magical hymns reflect a Greek imagery more than an Egyptian.⁵⁰

δεινή: Cf. 8.8.

πυριδρακοντόζωνε: Appearing only here and, possibly as an epithet of Abrasax, in a fragment of the *Kestoi* of Sextus Julius Africanus included by Preisendanz in the *PGM* owing to its magical content.⁵¹ The serpents, so frequent in Hecate's descriptions in the *PGM*, appear in earlier literature⁵² and underline the chthonic nature of the goddess. Even if we refuse to accept Kraus's hypothesis about the original mother-earth traits of Hecate (see lines 3–5), the snakes could easily have been added to her iconography thanks to her association with all those demonic creatures with serpentine traits that populate Greek mythological imagination, especially the Erinyes and the Gorgons (see above, γοργῶπι).⁵³

παῖ: Possibly used as a synonym of κόρη/Κόρη, underlining again the identification of Hecate with Persephone.

6–12 The passage seems to imply a Greek imagery background. According to LSJ the word ἥρωϝ in the title of this spell (IV 1390, see p. 219) has its later generic meaning 'blessed one', 'deceased'; thus, the title would offer the magician three different options: addressing some 'generic deceased' or, alternatively, gladiators, or those who had died violently. However, line 2 states that 'the ones who died untimely and violently' are meant, and the introductory procedure requires the magician to go 'where heroes and gladiators and those who died a violent

⁵⁰ Cf. here πυριδρακοντόζωνε, 15.11, 13–15, 51–2: snakes coil around the body of the goddess and, especially, the goddess is snake-haired, features that are missing from Egyptian demonic imagery, which favours composite, hybrid figures: see Fischer 1987, especially 20–1, 26.

⁵¹ *Cesti* 5.1.29 (XXIII 8).

⁵² E.g. Soph. *TrGF* fr. 535.5–6; Apoll. Rhod. 3.1214–15.

⁵³ E.g. Eur. *IT* 285–7 (Erinyes). Kraus 1960, 105–12. Cf. Porph. *De philo.* 134.1–4 (long snakes are running along Hecate's waist, slithering with pure tracks and hanging from the head to the feet they whirl around her in coils), 134.10 (Hecate with a snake coiled around her), 135.10–12 (Hecate coiled in snakes and snake-headed).

death were slain'. Therefore, here the 'hero' must be the prototype of somebody who died in combat and whose death was untimely (cf. line 19 and 14.12–15), but, unlike the gladiator, not a slave nor a criminal. Very probably the use of this word did not involve any reference to specific mythological characters, but it certainly echoed the typically Greek image of literary heroes who usually died violently and in an untimely fashion.⁵⁴

Moreover, the hymn stresses twice (line 10 and 19) that these deceased ones are 'unfortunate'. The adjective could refer either to their general condition of being dead, or of being ἄωροι and βιοθάνατοι, thus deprived of their eternal rest in the Underworld. Whatever the case, there must be a Greek background since in the Egyptian conception those who had died untimely and violently did not suffer the same fate (see line 2), and, once the dead became 'transfigured spirits', they were assimilated with the gods and able to live their eternal life, which was not considered to be a misfortune.

8, 11 καρπίσησθε: I prefer a derivation from κάρφος instead of καρπός, thus καρπίζομαι, 'enfranchise a slave', instead of καρπίζω, 'enjoy the fruits', 'make fruitful', since its usual rendering 'be useful/bring success to him' seems a little strained.

λειψίφωτες: See 1.28, 2.8–9. Even if here it refers to the deceased who 'left the light', curiously enough this word is found only in astrological contexts referring to the waning moon.⁵⁵

τῆς ἀσεβοῦς καὶ ἀνοσίας: The victim is accused of impiety to provide the goddess with a 'personal' reason for maltreating her, see 13.1–18.

13 See 22–8.

14–16 Mainly *voces magicae* – many *hapax legomena* – of uncertain meaning, among which ἄρβαθιάω and ἄβαώθ, a possible

⁵⁴ Cf. Ogden 2001, 12–16. Hopfner 1974–90, I.127–97.

⁵⁵ E.g. Dorotheus Sidonius, 346.27, 355.2; Vett. Val. app. 1.1.96, 1.1.223; Hephaest. *Apotel.* 103.9, 290.11.

distortion from $\Sigma\alpha\beta\alpha\omega\theta$, or from $\alpha\rho\beta\epsilon\theta\omega$, or simply $\alpha\rho\beta\alpha$ plus the feminine plural ending (see 3.22, 8.24, 26).⁵⁶

κυρία: Also at 29, cf. 1.2. As a proper epithet it is typical of Isis, especially in inscriptions from Egypt,⁵⁷ while in earlier literature it can be employed to describe $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$, ‘chance, fate’ – usually more as a concept than as an actual deity – as the uncontrollable dispenser of mis/fortune.⁵⁸ Even if in line 1 the Moirai and Necessities are invoked as separate entities, in other *PGM* passages we can find Hecate directly identified with all those deities that were traditionally thought to control fate: Moirai, Ananke (singular), Tyche and the Erinyes.⁵⁹ Also in *OH* 72 Tyche is identified both with Hecate and Artemis.⁶⁰

Of course Hecate could have been equated with ‘fate’ through the mediation of Isis-Tyche. The control of fate was among the competences of Isis since the New Kingdom, and, in the Hellenistic climate of assimilation (see **Intro.** pp. 8–10, 51–2), promoted her identification with foreign ‘fate’ deities such as Tyche or Nemesis.⁶¹ Therefore, it is certainly possible that the assimilation Hecate-‘fate’ was fostered by the mediation of Isis, but this is not strictly necessary. In fact, all the Greek ‘fate’ deities were previously connected with each other owing to the functions they shared. For example, Aeschylus

⁵⁶ For $\mu\omicron\rho\kappa\alpha$, possibly the Babylonian goddess Omorka, Betz 1992, 65, footnote 188; Fauth 2006, 44.

⁵⁷ E.g. Bernand and Bernand 1969, *passim*; also *Vitae Aesopi* G 5.8, 7.1; Plu. *De Iside* 367a3; *Corp.Herm.* fr. 24.16.1 (Nock and Festugière 1945–54, *ad loc.*); see Bricault 1996, 37–42; also *PGM* VII 492, 502, XXIVa 1; cf. *Sept. planet. imprecat.* *CCAG* 8.2.176.13–16, epithet of Selene; Merkelbach 1995, 98. Used for Hecate e.g. in *SEG* 38.1837.

⁵⁸ E.g. Aeschin. 2.131.3; Aristot. *EE* 1247a.5, *MM* 2.8.1.5; Menand. *Aspis* 147; Diod. Sic. 11.11.2.13; *Sentent. Pythagor.* 120.1. Villard, *LMC* ‘Tyche’.

⁵⁹ Tyche: IV 2602, 2665 (13.22); also in *OH* 72.1–2.

⁶⁰ Rudhardt 1991, 281–2; cf. Furley 2010, 167.

⁶¹ Herzog-Hauser, *RE* ‘ $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$ ’, 1674, 1682, 1686; Witt 1971, 150–1; Dunand 1973b, 92–4; Merkelbach 1995, 99; Kákosy 1995a, 2960–1; Quaegebeur 1975, 85–8; Isis is equated with Agathe Tyche in three of the Isidorus *Hymns*, see Vanderlip 1972 1.2, 2.1, 3.19; Kockelmann 2008, 66–7; Dousa 2002, 175–7.

says that Ananke is controlled by the Moirai and the Erinyes,⁶² or Tyche and the Moirai appear together in Archilochus as all-dispensers;⁶³ the Moirai can be daughters of Ananke, or Tyche can be one of the Moirai.⁶⁴ Moreover, there are three Moirai and three Erinyes, and the Erinyes have always had an infernal connotation.⁶⁵ Therefore, the identification Hecate-‘fate’ deities that we find in the *PGM* could have simply originated in the superimposition of all these entities together with the triple and chthonic nature of some of them. Coming back to *κυρία*, the later use of the term is quite generic, as it can be a synonym of ‘lady’, so that its appearance could be accidental despite these associations Hecate-Isis/Hecate-‘fate’.

Ἐρεσχιγά(λ): The name of the Babylonian goddess Ereškigal, queen of the Underworld, sister of Inanna (Ištar), is not attested in Greek literature outside the *PGM*,⁶⁶ where it frequently appears as a *vox magica* or alternative name especially of Hecate-Selene, but also of Isis and Aphrodite.⁶⁷ In spite of the similarities between the myths of Inanna and Persephone’s descent to the Underworld, Ereškigal lacks the mediating ability distinctive of Hecate (see lines 3–5). Therefore, the association between the two deities seems to rest only upon Hecate’s chthonic traits. The great variety and significance of demonic entities in the Babylonian pantheon could have also fostered

⁶² Aesch. *Pr.* 515–16; see lines 17–18: as the Erinyes were thought to seek their revenge also on earth, they were conceived as interfering with human destiny.

⁶³ Archil. fr. 16.1 (West); also e.g. Hom. *Il.* 19.87; Aesch. *Sept.* 975–7, 986–8; Luc. *Philops.* 25.16. See Furley 2010, 165.

⁶⁴ See II n.1; Paus. 7.26.8.7; Simon, *LIMC* ‘Ananke’.

⁶⁵ Greene 1944, 17. For the Moirai and their connection with death, De Angeli, *LIMC* ‘Moirai’. On the whole discussion, see Dieterich 1891, especially 93–6. It seems that in Anatolia chthonic Mother Goddesses were connected with the control of destiny: see Steiner 1971.

⁶⁶ However, it does appear in the *PDM* (xiv 211 [VII 26], 689 [XXIII 16]) where Hecate never does, which suggests that Ereškigal first arrived in Egypt during periods of intense cultural contact. Cf. Ritner 1995a, 3362.

⁶⁷ E.g. IV 336, 1417, 2485, 2750, 2914, VII 985; cf. Merkelbach 1995, 39–43.

the identification of Ereškigal with Hecate, leader of hosts of ghosts and demons.⁶⁸

νεβουτοσουαλήθ: This magical word is often found with Ἑρεσχιγάλ and ἀκτιῶφι in association with Hecate-Selene: the three *voces* would correspond to the three lunar phases.⁶⁹ The meaning of νεβουτοσουαλήθ is uncertain, but two derivations in particular have been suggested: one involving the Babylonian god Nebo, and the other the Egyptian *nbt-wẓdt*, 'lady of Uto'. They both remain problematic.⁷⁰

17–18 The request of sending an Erinys 'who awakens with fire – here as a metaphor for torments, rage – the souls of the dead'⁷¹ fits the accusation of impiety at line 12, since the three Erinyes were traditionally the personifications of curses put on evildoers and were supposed to avenge their crimes not only in the Underworld, but also on earth. The name of this Erinys, ὀργογοργονιοτριαν – formed from γοργόνειος through reduplication – is not surprising in view of the confusion between Gorgons and Erinyes (see line 5, γοργῶπι). The fact that Hecate is sometimes identified with and sometimes separated from the Erinyes (cf. 11.95) does not constitute a problem: they clearly underwent an iconographical – and partially functional – overlap, but Hecate, with her much more complex nature, remained their leader.

⁶⁸ Fauth 2006, 40–8; on Ereškigal, related myths and demons see Kramer 1960; Pettinato 2003; Wolkstein and Kramer 1983, 142–61. See further Schwemer, forthcoming, on Ereškigal and other Mesopotamian elements in the *PGM*.

⁶⁹ E.g. IV 2484–5, 2601–2, 2664–6 (13.21–2), 2749–50 (14.26), 2913–14 (Aphrodite); *PDM* xiv 689 [XXIII 16], *PDM* Suppl. 51 [II 22]. Fauth 2006, 40–52.

⁷⁰ Brashear 1995, 3425 and Glossary; Bonner 1950, 197–8; Preisendanz, *RE* 'Nebutosualeth'; Mastrocinque 2003, 106.

⁷¹ On the Erinyes persecuting the impious with fire and whip, e.g. Cornut. 11.12–13; cf. Eur. *IT* 288–90 (avenging demons and ghosts); cf. Dieterich 1891, 35–6. On the connection between Erinyes, death and especially βιοθάνατοι, Johnston 1999, 142–8, 250–87.

21 ἐπὶ ταῖς μυρίναις σοροῖς: In the reconstructed hymn 25, Preisendanz emends to μυρσίναις, ‘of myrtlewood’, though keeping ‘myrrh-oils scented’ (from μύρον, ‘unguent’) in the prose translation. However, as noted by Eitrem, the parallel in VIII 96–8, σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ ζυμυρνήνῃ σορῶ κατακείμενος, ἔχων ὑπαγκώνιον ῥητίνην καὶ ἄσφαλτον, ‘you (the headless god) are the one lying on a myrrh coffin having resin and bitumen as a cushion’, makes it clear that in our hymn the reference must be to the myrrh-scented oils that were used, together with resin and bitumen, for the mummification procedure. Preisendanz’s apparatus tells us that above the ν of μυρίναις the papyrus shows another ν, which would support the possibility of considering μυρίναις, ‘oil-scented’, a mistake for (σ)μυρνήναις, ‘of myrrh’. Unfortunately, if an extra ν was ever visible, it is not any longer, so that I cannot confirm its presence. Nevertheless, μυρίναις does not necessarily have to be a mistake for σμυρνήναις, since the association between perfumed oils and coffins is enough to allude to the mummification procedure.

22–8 The spirits are supposed to force the victim to come to the magician through tortures, in this case insomnia and ‘general’ pains, probably to be identified with inability to eat or drink. To prevent the victim from doing these life-preserving activities (to sleep, eat and drink), or to subject her to other sufferings leading her to madness, are typical compelling methods adopted by the *PGM* ἀγωγαί, ‘spells of attraction’, and belong to those procedures characteristic of the category of love magic that Faraone defined ‘for inducing *eros*’, to differentiate it from the category ‘to induce *philia*’.⁷² Though in the *PGM* the torture pattern is much more stressed, the underlying idea is found in earlier Greek literature. Pindar (*Pyth.* 4.213–19), in talking about the spells that Aphrodite taught Jason so that he could force Medea to fall in love with him, says that the *ἵνυx*

⁷² Faraone 1999, especially 41–95; also Martin 2005, 245–60.

(the magical bird/wheel employed in erotic magic, see 11.52) is the bird 'that causes madness' and that, through the incantations, Jason 'could strip Medea of reverence for her parents, and a longing for Greece would shake her with the whip of Persuasion as she was burning in the heart'. In 14.19–20, 32–4, we read 'and if she lies keeping someone else on her bosom, may she repel him, and place me in her heart', and 'forgetting her children and her habits with parents and abhorring all the race of men and women but me'.⁷³ In Theocritus *Idyll* 2.28–31 Simaetha, casting a spell on her negligent lover, says, 'as I melt this wax (figurine), may Delphis of Myndus melt this hour with love, and as this wheel of brass turns by grace of Aphrodite, may he turn again before my threshold' (cf. 14.21–2, 31). Faraone showed how this kind of spell has a close affinity with curses, as the 'erotic seizure' was generally conceived and described in literature as an 'illness' and a form of 'madness'.⁷⁴ Not sleeping, eating and drinking were traditionally considered symptoms of love sickness. Martinez⁷⁵ associated them with the purifying fast used to ritualize a state of *ekstasis* and at the same time noticed the affinity between these love curses and the vows of abstinence from food and drink: a form of self-inflicted curse in which the performer secludes himself from conventional social behaviour and thus approaches a state of *mania* that will be maintained until the accomplishment of the intended task. The pattern can be traced as far back as Homer, *Iliad* 19.205–10, where Achilles, in the grip of wrath for Patroclus'

⁷³ Faraone 1993; cf. e.g. *DT* 230 (Latin, first century AD, Carthage): '... take away the sleep from that woman until she comes to me ... burning with love ... drive NN from her parents'; for other early date examples cf. *Suppl.* 72.14–16 (Augustan age), 'may not drink, nor sit down, nor eat, but may he have me in his mind', 73.5–7 (first century AD), 'if she is sleeping, let her not keep sleeping; if she is eating, let her not keep eating; if she is drinking, let her not keep drinking, until she comes to me'.

⁷⁴ Also Petropoulos 1988.

⁷⁵ Martinez 1995, especially 352–9. See also Versnel 1998, especially 247–67.

death, swears that he will neither eat nor drink until he kills Hector.

There are notable similarities with Homer, *Odyssey* 12.338, οἱ δ' ἄρα μοι γλυκὺν ὕπνον ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἔχευαν, 'but they poured sweet sleep upon my eyelids', and *OH* 78.9, ἡνίκα τὸν γλυκὺν ὕπνον ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ἀποσεΐσης, 'when you shake the sweet sleep off the eyelids'.

30 εἰνοδία: Standard epithet of Hecate and Hermes, who shared the function of protectors of the streets – especially crossroads and other liminal points – where their apotropaic images were erected (see **II** n.21);⁷⁶ also a Thessalian goddess 'of the roads' (see lines 3–5, **II** n.23).

κύων μέλαινα: In Greek tradition, dogs⁷⁷ have always had an ambivalent symbolism: in their 'domestic' aspect they appear as guards, helpers and companions of men and deities, especially Artemis, huntress goddess *par excellence*; at the same time they have a strong chthonic component, attested by the mythical role they play as monstrous creatures in the Underworld (e.g. Cerberus),⁷⁸ and by the belief that the ghosts of the unburied dead could appear in the shape of dogs.⁷⁹ The Erinyes or the Harpies can be described as dogs, and Hecate

⁷⁶ Hecate: e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 1199, *TrGF* fr. 535.2; Eur. *Hel.* 570, *Ion* 1048 (cf. line 4 Περσέφασσα); Cornut. 73.6; Hippol. *Refut.* 4.35.5.2; *OH* 1.1, cf. 72.2 (Τύχη ἐνοδῖτιν). Hermes: Theocr. 25.4; Cornut. 23.22, 24.9; Arrian, *Cyn.* 35.3.3; *AP* 6.299.1. The epithet is attested also for Artemis, but possibly owing to her identification with Hecate.

⁷⁷ Mainoldi 1981 and 1984, especially 37–51, 59–68; also Malten 1914, 236–8; Laumonier 1958, 419–20; Kraus 1960, 25–6; Lilja 1976, especially 65; Johnston 1990, 135–6, 140–2; Zografou 2010, 249–83.

⁷⁸ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 8.368, *Od.* 11.623; Hes. *Th.* 309–12, 769–74; Aristoph. *Ra.* 472; Apoll. Rhod. 3.1217; Cerberus often has three heads and serpentine traits: see **II** n.31. The canine component also appears in the iconography of the sea monster Scylla, who according to Apoll. Rhod. (4.828–9) would have been the daughter of Hecate and sometimes can be three-headed (e.g. Anaxilas, *PCG* fr. 22.4).

⁷⁹ E.g. Aristoph. *Ra.* 292; Lycophr. 1175–7; Luc. *Philops.* 22.7–8, 24.1–6; Porph. *De philo.* 151.9, *ap.* Euseb. *PE* 4.23.7.9–8.2 (commenting that dogs are demons); cf. Redfield 1975, 193–202.

CONCLUSIONS

herself can be called ‘bitch’ or said to have a dog head.⁸⁰ Furthermore, dogs were considered impure, and thus were not sacrificed to the Olympians, but they seem to have been part of the offerings constituting the ‘suppers’ of Hecate (see line 2) or to have been generally immolated to this deity.⁸¹ Another reason for the association between the dog and Hecate is her long-standing identification with Artemis (see lines 3–5), whose typical companion was the dog. The black colour of our ‘bitch’ was probably chosen to emphasize the chthonic, dreadful nature of the deity.⁸² The dog’s chthonic aspect probably developed from the fear of this animal as devourer of corpses, exactly as happened in Egypt with the jackal Anubis,⁸³ another psychopomp Netherworld deity, whose popularity must have contributed to reinforcing this imagery.

CONCLUSIONS

The whole hymn is intertwined with its ritual context and has a simple structure: a short *epiclēsis* (lines 1–5) is followed by a sort of very long narrative *euchē* – in which epithets and *voces magicae* are interpolated – clearly composed *ad hoc* for erotic magic.

Apart from a few magical words such as ἄρβαθιάω (line 14), all the divine attributes fit with the traditional or the Hellenistic image of Hecate, and unless we want to consider τρικάρανος

⁸⁰ E.g. Erinyes: Aesch. *Ch.* 924, 1054, *Eu.* 131–2; Soph. *El.* 1388; Eur. *Or.* 260; Hesych. K 4763; Lilja 1976, especially 56–7, 66, 103, 127. Harpies: Apoll. Rhod. 2.289; Hecate: Eur. fr. 42c* (Snell); Aristoph. *PCG* fr. 608; Plu. *Cimon* 18.2.1–3.5; Aelius Dionysius, *Ἀττικά ὀνόματα* A 14; Paus. *Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων* A 7 (Hesych. A 252; Phot. A 114); Porph. *De abst.* 3.17.9–10, 4.16.33; Orph. *Arg.* 978–9. Cf. Drexler, *LM* ‘Kyon’; for Hecate with the dog, Sarian, *LIMC* ‘Hecate’; Werth 2006, 173–84; cf. Karouzou 1972, especially 64–6.

⁸¹ E.g. Plu. *Aet. Rom.* 277b1–2, 280b10–280c4, 290d; Paus. 3.14.9.4–9; Zaganariis 1975; Mainoldi 1984, 55–7.

⁸² Cf. Luc. and Paus. in **II** n.79 and n.81 respectively; *Scholia in Lycophr.* 1176.16–17.

⁸³ Altenmüller, *LdÄ* ‘Anubis’.

as a lunar attribute (see lines 3–5), the goddess does not show any lunar traits. The choice of a couple of epithets is likely to have been fostered by contact with Egyptian tradition (see lines 30 κύων, possibly 5, 14–16 κυρία), but has a Greek explanation too. Similarly, the mention of μυστρίαις σοροῖς (line 21) seems to imply an Egyptian setting but not necessarily to point to an Egyptian religious tradition. In Graeco-Roman Egypt mummification was not exclusive to ‘Egyptians’, but was largely adopted by Greeks and Romans too. They did not only adopt embalming practices, but also Egyptian funerary deities such as Osiris and Anubis, who appear even in the catacombs of Alexandria, where one would expect a stronger Greek connotation.⁸⁴ Of course rituals and implements that were typical of Egyptian funerary practice partly changed. For example, the *Book of the Dead*, though still in use in the Ptolemaic period, was progressively copied in smaller portions. However, if we turn to the embalming itself (alluded to by our hymn), mummies as late as the fourth century AD have been found.⁸⁵ The mention of coffins scented with oils would be just another way to specify that the entities invoked are dead and, as heroes and heroines, belong to a higher status than common people. Furthermore, the underlying conceptions about for example demonic entities and erotic magic (see lines 2, 22–8) can be easily traced back to Greek tradition, exactly as the Moirai, Ananke, Phthonus and the Erinyes are peculiar to Greek mythology.

⁸⁴ Kaplan 1999, especially 21–2, Tab. 1; Venit 2002, 10–14 in general, and especially 119–67 on Alexandria.

⁸⁵ On the subject see Dunand 2002; Riggs 2005, 1–6, e.g. 105–26, 245–56; Riggs 2010, especially 345–8; Kaplan 1999, especially 7–17; Cartron 2012, especially I.146–9, 217–23; Bowman 1986, 186–8; Taylor 2001, 87–91, 241–3; Kákosy 1995a, 3001–5, 3013–14; Dunand and Lichtenberg 1995, especially 3253–7, 3259–66, 3273–6, 3299–301.

HYMN Ι Ι

HYMN TO HECATE-SELENE: IV 2242–347 (FOURTH CENTURY)

This is the longest metrical section of the *PGM* and is almost the only constituent of a spell entitled δέλτος ἀποκρουστικὴν πρὸς Σελήνην, ‘inscription to the waning moon’ (IV 2241–358): the **hymn** is followed by a long string of *voces magicae* and two non-metrical lines. The magician, taking advantage of the new moon period, threatens the goddess that he will prolong the obscurity indefinitely. Apparently, the purposes of the spell depend on the magician’s will, but the only specific reference mentions ‘causing misfortune (perhaps illness or death)’ to the victim. Lines 26–44 consist of an endless list of unmetrical epithets, mainly *hapax legomena*, sometimes of uncertain reading and tentatively reconstructed. Though kept in the text, they will be only briefly analysed owing to their unmetrical nature.

Often clumsy iambic trimeters. Guide edition: Pr (also reconstructed hymn 17).

- χαῖρε, ἱερὸν φῶς, ταρταροῦχε, φωτο|πλήξ,
χαῖρε, ἱερὰ αὐγὴ ἐκ σκότους εἰλημ|μένη,
ἀναστατοῦσα πάντα βουλαῖς ἀστό|χοις· | (2245)
καλέσω, καὶ ἀκούσῃ μου τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων |
5 φρικτῆς Ἀνάγκης πάντοτέ σοι ὑπεστρωμένης· |
δεθεῖσα τρεῖς λύθητι, ἐλθέ, βρίμασον
τὸν δεῖνα· | Κλωθὼ γὰρ ἐπικλώσει σοι λῖνα.
νεῦσον, μάκαιρα, | πρὶν στυγνὴν σε καταλάβω,
πρὶν τοὺς ξιφῆ|ρεις ἀναλάβῃς σου κονδύλους, (2250)
10 πρὶν ἡδὲ | λυσσῆς, ἰσο|υ|πάρθενος κύων.
τὸ δεῖνα ποιήσεις, | κἂν θέλῃς κἂν μὴ θέλῃς,

- ὅτι οἶδά σου τὰ | φῶτα πρὸς) στιγμῆς μέτρον
 καὶ τῶν καλῶν σου μυσταγωγὸς πραγμάτων
 ὑπο|υρ(γός) εἰμι καὶ συνίστωρ, παρθένε. (2255)
- 15 τὸ δεῖ | γενέσθαι, τοῦτ' οὐκ ἔξεστι φυγεῖν·
 τὸ δεῖν|α ποι(ή)σεις, κἂν θέλῃς κἂν μὴ θέλῃς. |
 ἐνεύχομαί σοι τήνδε νύκτα κυρίαν, |
 ἐν ᾗ τὸ σὸν φῶς ὕστατον χωρίζεται,
 ἐν ᾗ | κύων κέχηνε καὶ οὐ κλείει στόμα, (2260)
- 20 ἐν ᾗ | τὸ κλειθρον ἠνέφυγε Ταρτάρου,
 ἐν ᾗ | προλυσσᾷ Κέρβερος κεραύνοπλο{υ}ς· |
 ἔγειρε σεαυτήν, ἡλιωτίδος τροφοῦ |
 χρήζουσα Μήνη{ν}, νερτέρων ἐπίσκοπε, |
 ἐνεύχομαί σοι, ξεινή τ' αὐγή, παρθένε, | (2265)
- 25 ἐνεύχομαί σοι, δαιδάλη καίπή, θοή, |
 λοφαίη, ὀλκίτι φασγάνων, θυμάνδρεια, |
 παιωνία, προμηθική, πολυκλεί|τη,
 νύσσα, ποδάρκη, ἀλκίμη, πορφυ|ρέη, (2270)
- 30 Περσία, νομαῖε, Ἀλκυόνη, χρυ|σοστεφεῇ,
 πρέσβειρα, φαεννώ, πε|λαγίη, εἰδωλίη,
 ἰνδαλίμη, διχθάς, | βαριδοῦχε, εὖστοχε,
 αὐτοφυής, μι|τρίη, ἀνδρείη, στρατηλάτι, (2275)
- 35 Δωδωνίη, | Ἰδαῖα, νεοπενθής, λυκώ,
 στηλῖτι, | οὐλοή, ἀκρίη, χαροπή, ὄξυβόη,
 θα|σία, Μήνη, πύματ', ἡγκαλισμένη |
 ἀκτῖνας, ἡ σώτειρα, πανγαίη, κυνώ, |
 κλωθαίη, πανδώτειρα, δολιχή, | κυδίμη, (2280)
- 40 ἀνασσα, ἀρηγέ, ἀγλαή, εὐ|ρύστοχε,
 αἰζηίη, ἀγία, ἡμέρη, | ἀφθίτη,
 λιγ{γ}εῖα, λιπαροπλόκαμε, | θαλία, ζαθείη,
 χρυσῶπι, τερψίμβρο|τε, Μινῶα, λοχιάς, (2285)
- 45 θηβαία, τλητή, δολόεσσα, ἀτασθάλη,
 ἀκτινοχαῖτι, | ἰοχέαιρα, παρθένε·
 δόλου γέμουσαν | καὶ φόβου σωτηρίην
 ἧ σ' οἶδα, πάντων | ὥς μάγων ἀρχηγέτης,
 Ἑρμῆς ὁ πρέ|σβυς, Ἰσιδος πατήρ ἐγώ. (2290)

HYMN TO HECATE-SELENE

- ἄκουσον, | ἦω φορβα Βριμῶ σαχμι νεβουτο|σουαληθ
 τοῦτο γάρ σου σύμβολον,
 τὸ σάν|δαλόν σου ἔκρυσα καὶ κλεῖδα κρατῶ.
 50 ἦνοιξα | ταρταροῦχου κλεῖθρα Κερβέρου |
 καὶ νύκτα τὴν ἄωρον παρέδωκα σκότει. | (2295)
 ῥόμβον στρέφω σοι, κυμβάλων οὐχ ἄπτομαι· |
 ἄθρησον εἰς σε, Νειλωίτιδος χάριν,
 55 κάτοπτρον | ἦν ἰδοῦσα σαυτὴν θαυμάσεις
 πρὶν ἢ μέλαν | φῶς ἐκπτύσης ἀπ' ὀμμάτων.
 ὃ δεῖ σε ποιῆ|σαι, τοῦτο δεῖ σε μὴ φυγεῖν· (2300)
 τὸ δεῖνα μοι ποιήσεις, | κἂν θέλῃς, κἂν μὴ θέλῃς·
 ἵππος, Κόρη, δρά|καινα, λαμπάς, ἀστραπή,
 ἀστήρ, λέων, λύ|καινα, αἰωηη
 60 σκεῦος παλαιόν, κόσκι|νόν μου σύμβολον,
 καὶ ψωμὸς εἷς, κόραλ|λος, αἶμα τρυγόνος, (2305)
 ὄνυξ καμήλου καὶ βοὸς | θριξ παρθένου,
 Πανὸς γόνος, πῦρ ἡλιω|τίδος βολῆς,
 χαμαῖλυκον, νήθουσα, παι|δέρως, ἀρίς,
 65 γλαυκῆς γυναικὸς σῶμα | διεσκελισμένον,
 σφιγγὸς μελαίνης | ἥ φύσις τορουμένη· (2310)
 ἅπαντα ταῦτα | σύμβολόν μου πνεύματος.
 ὅλης ἀνάγ|κης δεσμὰ συνραγήσεται,
 καὶ κρύψει σὸν | φῶς Ἥλιος πρὸς τὸν νότον,
 70 Τηθύς τε | τὴν σὴν κουφίσει οἰκουμένην,
 Αἰὼν | κραδαίνει, κινηθήσεται οὐρανός, (2315)
 Κρόνος | φοβηθεὶς τὸν βεβιασμένον σου νοῦν |
 πέφευγε εἰς Ἄ|τιδην, νερτέρων ἐπίσκοπος. |
 Μοῖραί σου τὸν ἀνέκλ(ε)ιπτον ρίπτουσι μίτον, |
 75 ἂν μὴ μαγείης τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναγκάσης |
 βέλος πετηνὸν ταχύτατον τέλος δραμεῖν. | (2320)
 οὐ γὰρ φυγεῖν ἔξεστι μοῖράν μου λόγων, |
 ὃ δεῖ γενέσθαι, μὴ σα(υ)τὴν ἀναγκάσης |
 ἄνωθεν εἰς ἄνω{θεν} τ' ἀκούειν συμβόλων. |
 80 τὸ δεῖνα ποιήσεις, κἂν θέλῃς κἂν μὴ θέλῃς, |
 ἀχρ(ε)ίου φωτὸς πρὶν σε μοῖρα καταλάβῃ, | (2325)
 ποιήσον, ὃ λέγω, ταρταροῦχε παρθένε. |
 ἔδησα δεσμοῖς τοῖς Κρόνου τὸν σὸν πόλον |
 καὶ σφίγξει ἀνάγκη(ς) ἀντίχειρά σου κρατῶ. |

- 85 οὐ γ{ε}ίνεται αὔριον, εἰ μὴ γένηται, ὃ βούλομαι. |
 ἔνευσας Ἑρμῇ, τῷ θεῶν ἀρχηγέτῃ, | (2330)
 εἰς τήνδε τὴν πρᾶξιν συμβαλεῖν· σ' ἦ μὴν ἔχω. |
 ἄκουσον, ἡ θεωροῦσα καὶ θεωρουμένη· |
 βλέπω σε, καὶ βλέπεις με, εἴτα κάγώ σοι |
 90 σημεῖον ἔρῳ· χάλκεον τὸ σάνδαλον
 τῆς | ταρταρούχου, στέμμα, κλείς, κηρύκιον, | (2335)
 ρόμβος σιδηροῦς καὶ κύων κυάνεος, |
 κλειῖθρον τρίχωρον, ἐσχάρα πυρουμένη, |
 σκότος, βυθός, φλόξ, Ταρτάρου σημάντρια |
 95 φοβοῦσα Ἑρινὺς δαίμονας τεραστίους, |
 εἰσηλθας; ἦκεις; ὀργίσθητι, παρθένε, | (2340)
 τῷ δεῖνα, ἐχθρῷ τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ θεῶν, |
 Ἥλιου Ὀσίριδος καὶ συνεύνου Ἴσιδος. |
 οἶον λέγω σοι, εἴσβαλε εἰς τοῦτον κακόν, |
 100 ὅτι οἶδα σὰ τὰ καλὰ καὶ μεγάλα, Κόρη,
 ὀνόμα|τα σεμνά, οἷς φωτίζεται οὐρανός (2345)
 καὶ γαῖα | πίνει τὴν δρόσον καὶ κυοφορ(εῖ), |
 ἐξ ὧν ὁ κόσμος αὐξεται {τε} καὶ λείπεται. |

10 πρὶν ἢ δὲ λυσσῆς, Pr (hymns); πρηνὴ τε λυσσῆς, Pr 11 δινα,
 P 15 διψγενεστε τουτ', P 16 τον ἄ αποισεις, P; τὸ δεῖ ποι(ή)-
 σεις, Pr 19 κεχηναι, κλειει P 20 ηνεωχε, P 22 τροπου,
 P 23 μηνην, P 24 ξενηδauγη, P 25 καιπιθοη, P 26
 ολκιτι λοφαιη, θυμαντρια, P 27 προθμηεισδauγη, P; προ-
 μηθικῇ, Pr; δauγη possibly written by mistake from line 24 29
 σκοπεη, P 30 νομεη, P 32 διχθησ, P; διχθασ, Bortolani;
 δειχτιρα, and then δειχτειρα, Pr; βαρυδουχε, P 34 ειδεα,
 P 35 στηλητι, αρκηϊ, P 36 πηματηνκαλισμενην, P 39
 ευ|ροστουχε, P 40 εξηειη, εμερη P 41 ζαιειθη, P 50
 ταρταρου κερβερου, P 54 ἦν, Kuster (see Pr apparatus); ἦν
 ἰδοῦσα σαυτήν, θαυμάσεις, Pr 57 ἄ for δεῖνα, P; τὸ δεῖ μοι
 ποιήσεις, Pr; τὸ δεῖνα {μοι} ποιήσεις, Pr (hymns) 66
 θεωρουμενη, P 76 πετηνου, P 78 οδεισε, P 79 συμβο-
 λον, P 80 δ(εινα), P; τὸ δεῖ, Pr; τὸ δεῖνα, Pr (hymns) 84
 Bortolani, following the reading of Bonner 1930 (καὶ Σφιγγὸς ἀνάγκη)
 as closer to the papyrus reading: καισιπνιγianaγκη, P; καὶ ὀπιδνῇ
 ἀνάγκη, Pr 89 καγω σε, P 97 δινα, P 102 κοιφορ, P

HYMN TO HECATE-SELENE

Translation

- Hail, sacred light, holder of Tartarus, who hit with your light,
hail, sacred light who have been taken from darkness,
who overturn all things with aimless decisions.
I will call, and you will hear my sacred words
- 5 as terrifying Necessity is always subject to you;
O thrice bound, may you be unbound, come, rage
against him, NN, for Clotho will spin destinies for you.
Nod, O blessed one, before I constrain you, hateful,
before you raise your fists armed with swords,
- 10 before you become furious, maiden-like bitch.
You will fulfil the NN matter, whether you want it or not,
because I know your lights up to the minimum detail
and I am your mystagogue of good deeds,
your assistant and one who knows, maiden.
- 15 It is impossible to avoid what has to happen;
you will fulfil the NN matter, whether you want it or not.
I adjure you in this decisive night,
in which your last light goes away,
in which a dog has opened its mouth and does not close it,
- 20 in which the lock of Tartarus is opened,
in which Cerberus, armed with a thunderbolt, is furious.
Awake, you who need the solar nourisher,
Mene, guardian of the dead,
I adjure you, stranger light, maiden,
- 25 I adjure you, artful and lofty, agile,

crested one, who draw swords, with the heart of a man,
healer, far-sighted, very renowned,
goaded one, swift-footed, valiant, purple-red,
gloomy, Brimo, immortal, listener,
- 30 Persian, who belong to the flock, Alcyone, with a gold crown,
venerable, shining, marine, ghostly,
who can appear, twofold, who hold the boat, who aim well,
self-growing, with a headband, manly, leader of armies,
goddess of Dodona, of Ida, who cry with a recent pain,
she-wolf,

- 35 like an infamous stele, fatal, who are in the highest point, flashing-
 eyed, shrill-screaming,
 Thasian, Mene, utmost, who embrace
 light beams, saviour, who are in all the earth, bitch,
 spinner of fate, who give everything, long-lasting, glorious,
 queen, helper, splendid, wide-aimer,
 40 robust, sacred, meek, immortal,
 with a shrill voice, with shining hair, like a sprout, very venerable,
 with golden face, who delight mortals, Minoan, who helps during
 childbirth,
 Theban, steadfast in suffering, cunning, wicked,
 with hair of beams, shooter of arrows, maiden;
- 45 I really know you are full of deception and saviour from fear,
 like the chief of all magicians,
 Hermes the elderly, I am Isis' father.
 Listen, $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\omicron}$ PHORBA BRIMO SACHMI NEBOUTOSOUALĒTH,
 as this is your symbol;
 I hid your sandal, and I am holding your key tight.
- 50 I opened the locks of Cerberus, holder of Tartarus,
 and I handed over premature night to darkness.
 I am spinning the magical wheel for you, I am not touching
 the cymbals;
 gaze at yourself, beauty of the Lady of the Nile,
 seeing which (beauty) in the mirror you will admire yourself
- 55 before you start spitting dark light from your eyes.
 You must not avoid what you must do.
 You will fulfil the NN matter, whether you want it or not,
 mare, Core, dragoness, torch, thunderbolt,
 star, lion, she-wolf, $\Lambda\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\omicron}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}$,
- 60 an ancient tool, a sieve is my symbol,
 and one piece of bread, a coral, blood of a turtle-dove,
 hoof of a camel and hair of a virgin cow,
 the seed of Pan, fire of a solar bolt,
 holy vervain, spindle tree (?), acanthus (? or various thorny plants),
 edder-wort,
- 65 the opened out body of a bluish-shining woman,
 the pierced vagina of a black sphinx-ape:

HYMN TO HECATE-SELENE

all these things are the symbol of my magical power.
The bonds of total Necessity will be broken into pieces,
and Helios will hide your light in the south,
70 and Tethys will relieve your world (of its inhabitants),
Aion shakes, the sky will be deranged,
Cronus frightened by the constraining of your mind
has fled to Hades as guardian of the dead.
The Moirai throw away your inexhaustible thread,
75 unless you force the winged dart
of my magic to hasten most quickly to the target.
For it is impossible to avoid the fate of my words,
what has to happen; do not constrain yourself
to hear the symbols from the beginning and backwards.
80 You will do the NN matter, whether you want it or not,
before the fate of useless light falls on you,
do what I say, maiden, holder of Tartarus.
I bound your orbit with Cronus' chains
and I seize your thumb with the tight noose of necessity.
85 Tomorrow will not come, if what I want does not happen.
You granted Hermes, chief of the gods,
that you would contribute to this spell: surely I am holding you
(in my power).
Listen, you who observe and are observed;
I look at you, and you look at me, and then I
90 will tell you the symbol: bronze sandal
of her, the holder of Tartarus, wreath, key, herald's wand,
iron magic wheel and dark dog,
lock with three holes, burning altar,
darkness, abyss, flame; O guide of Tartarus
95 who frighten the Erinyes, monstrous daimons,
have you come? Are you here? Get angry, maiden,
with him, NN, enemy of the gods in the sky,
of Helios Osiris and his bed-mate Isis.
I am telling you, throw misfortune on him,
100 because I know your beautiful and great
venerable names, Core, by which the sky is lightened
and earth drinks dew and is pregnant,
through which the cosmos increases and decreases.

COMMENTARY

1 χαῖρε: Also at 2, see 5.1.

ἱερὸν φῶς, ταρταροῦχε, φωτοπλήξ: The first⁸⁶ and the last⁸⁷ epithet refer to the lunar nature of the goddess (see 10.3–5 τρικάρανε), while the second⁸⁸ to her chthonic (see 10.3–5).

2 ἱερὰ αὐγή ἐκ σκότους εἰλημμένη: Preisendanz translates ‘heiliger Lichtglanz, der du aus dem Dunkel genommen bist’, while Betz, deriving the verb from εἰλέω (with an extra μ) instead of λαμβάνω, chooses ‘Holy Beam who whirl up out of darkness’.⁸⁹ In both solutions the moonlight somehow emerges from darkness: the moon regains her light after the new moon. As a general statement it fits the context, but the whole hymn stresses that the invocation is performed exactly during the new moon, or immediately before, and two epithets have already stated the bright nature of the moon (see line 1). It has also been proposed to correct εἰλημμένη to ἐνημμένη, from ἐνάπτω, ‘to clad in’,⁹⁰ to obtain something like ‘light clad in darkness’. However, there is no need to change the reading (ἐνάπτω would govern an accusative anyway) since λαμβάνω could be used in its meaning of ‘to seize’, ‘overtake’, and ἐκ could introduce the agent of the action.⁹¹ Therefore, I prefer the translation ‘[you] sacred light, who have been overtaken by darkness’, referring to the oncoming new moon.

3–5 Hecate has total control over fate, as shown by her identification with all those deities that were traditionally thought to control human destiny (see 10.14–16 κυρία).

⁸⁶ Cf. IV 978, 1066–8, where it appears together with ἱερὰ αὐγή (see line 2) to describe the light of a lamp used in the magical procedure identified with the light of the god who is supposed to manifest in the flame.

⁸⁷ *Hapax*.

⁸⁸ A late formation used, apart from the *PGM*, in Christian literature for the ‘infernal angels’ and Satan, e.g. *Ev. Barth.* 4.25.5; Hippol. *Comm. in Dan.* 2.29.11.2. On Tartarus as a region of the Underworld, Kirk et al. 1985–93, *ad Il.* 8.15–16.

⁸⁹ Following the suggestion of Smith 1981, 645–6.

⁹⁰ *Pr apparatus*.

⁹¹ LSJ, III.5: alternatively, of cause, III.6.

τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων: Cf. 1.4, 22, 27, 2.17.

6–10 Again the passage refers to the moon in her phase of obscurity. Saying that the goddess is ‘thrice-bound’ means that she cannot manifest herself in any of her three phases. Alternatively, **τρίς** could be linked to **λύθητι** and the phrase would become ‘O you who are bound (new moon), may you be unbound thrice (may you manifest yourself in all your three phases)’. In his study on this hymn, Smith comments:⁹² ‘Even had she been bound by the famous bonds of necessity she is now loosed and must come to roar at the victim, for Clotho thus will spin her web. The magician controls the fates . . . This argument is reinforced with threats. The goddess had better consent before she is compelled to obey resentfully. The magician threatens violence: he will take hold of her sword-bearing fists.’ Smith also accepts the correction **πρὶν ἢ βδελύσσης**, ‘before you feel disgust’, at line 10 saying ‘If the goddess does not obey, the magician warns, she will loathe the consequences.’ Some comments are needed. First, it is clear that the goddess is not ‘loosed’ yet, but she will be bound as long as the new moon lasts. Second, in lines 3 and 5 the text states that it is the goddess who controls fates, not the magician, which fits the general background, otherwise he would not need divine help to obtain what he wants. The magician simply takes advantage of the natural phenomenon of the new moon to pretend that, being himself a god (Hermes-Thoth, see line 47), he is able to prolong this status forever. But, had the new moon not occurred, he would not have been able to constrain the goddess. Furthermore, the appearance of Clotho alone as a symbol of inevitability is at least curious. Third, though philologically the correction at line 10 is plausible, taking ‘before you feel disgust’ as referring to the consequences of the magician’s wrath sounds a little contrived. Apart from that, the text at 8–9 is difficult to read as Smith

⁹² Smith 1981; cf. Fauth 2006, 52–6.

would like: it is true that further on in the hymn the magician says he ‘holds tight the thumb of the goddess’ (see line 84), but to interpret the phrase in this way we should ignore *πρὶν ἀναλάβης*.

The sense of the passage seems to imply that the new moon which is about to occur is a negative phase for the lunar goddess since she cannot radiate her light (‘bound’). In lines 6–7 the magician seems simply to ask the goddess, without any threats. As Clotho was often the first of the Moirai, namely the one that spun the thread of life/birth, ‘Clotho will spin destinies for you’ could mean ‘you will come back to life’, since after the new moon a new crescent will wax again, exactly as at 74–5 the Moirai throwing away the thread of the moon are used as a metaphor for ‘her death’, i.e. the everlasting obscurity.⁹³ Thus, the magician at first asks kindly, almost reassuring the deity: ‘now you are bound, but set yourself free and attack NN, as you will wax again’. Then, if we keep the papyrus reading, in lines 9–10 the furious Hecate raising swords would represent the most dangerous and darkest aspect of the lunar goddess:⁹⁴ her phase of obscurity, when the doors of the Underworld are opened. The general sense of lines 8–10 would be: ‘say yes to my requests willingly before I have to constrain you, say yes before the new moon arrives (and, thus, before I have the possibility of prolonging the obscurity forever)’. In fact, it is only immediately after that the magician starts explaining that, even if the goddess does not want to consent, she will have to, as he knows perfectly the mechanics of her phases, her symbols and so on. It is

⁹³ Similarly Porph. *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* 8.72–5; cf. Posidon. fr. 398.57 (Theiler) for Clotho’s connection with the moon.

⁹⁴ The avenging sword is a symbol of Hecate as a goddess of retribution: cf. its frequent appearance in the iconography of the Erinyes and Dike, Sarian, *LIMC* ‘Erinyes’; Shapiro, *LIMC* ‘Dike’. Cf. **10.4**, **II** n.40. Alternatively it could be connected with Hecate’s apotropaic function: Werth 2006, 197–9.

only in the final part that the threat of prolonging the new moon indefinitely is actually performed, as a last resource.

νεῦσον, μάκαιρα: See 7.5, 1.20.

ἰσο{υ}πάρθενος κύων: See 10.3–5, 30.

11–16 Cf. lines 6–10. The magician possesses secret knowledge which will compel the goddess to his will: a quite common idea in Egyptian tradition. The word **μυσταγωγός** seems to be used in its generic meaning of ‘guide’, which would clarify the sense of line 13: ‘I am the one who will guide you so that you can do the right thing’,⁹⁵ i.e. fulfil my requests. However, **μυσταγωγός** was not chosen by chance, since, together with ‘assistant’ and ‘one who knows’, it seems to imply a priestly knowledge. Even if the reading **ὑπουργός** is a conjecture, being an assistant of the goddess – or her priest – is not in contrast with threatening her,⁹⁶ at least not in Egyptian magic, where the possibility of threatening originates in the cultic sphere of the temple. The daily rituals performed by the priests were thought to be indispensable for keeping the gods alive, so that their very existence was in the hands of men: the threat of interrupting the temple rituals could be used to force the god to do the priest’s will.⁹⁷ In this context, the reference to a secret knowledge concerning the deity is used to enforce the threat since it means that the speaker is a priest: he has both access to the deity’s secrets and the power to interrupt temple rituals.⁹⁸

παρθένε: Also at lines 24, 44, 82 and 96, see 10.3–5 **παρθένε**.

17–21 It is the night of the new moon, when the ghostly and demonic entities were thought to be particularly dangerous, since, in the absence of their mistress, they were more likely

⁹⁵ LSJ, 2.

⁹⁶ As Smith 1981, 647, seems to think.

⁹⁷ Brashear 1995, 3392; Sauneron 1951; see **Intro.** n.59.

⁹⁸ Cf. the cult-theology treatise about the king as sun priest, preserved in various versions from the Middle Kingdom onwards, where a long list of statements starting with ‘he knows’ alludes to information about the mysteries of the sun journey: Assmann 1970; also Assmann 1995, 17–26.

to cross the border of the Underworld (see 10.2). The dog of line 19 seems to be Cerberus of line 21: the open mouth serves as a metaphor both for his rage and for the opened lock of Tartarus. Obviously, as Hecate κλειδοῦχος is temporarily absent, the doors of the Underworld are opened. It is true that in Egyptian tradition the jackal god Anubis often guards the entrance to the Underworld,⁹⁹ but here Cerberus does not perforce have to be Anubis, since the Greek three-headed dog was already the doorkeeper of Hades.¹⁰⁰

22–4 Mene – from μήν, ‘month’ – is another name for Selene, underlining her monthly cyclicity: the moon is said to shine only thanks to the reflected light of the sun. Plutarch, in his detailed discussion on the subject,¹⁰¹ records that Parmenides called the moon ἀλλότριον φῶς,¹⁰² ‘stranger light’ – here ξείνη αὐγή. Interestingly enough, Plutarch also explains¹⁰³ that Persephone is a lunar goddess and was called Κόρη (from its meaning ‘pupil’, and not ‘maiden’), as the images in front of the eye are reflected in the pupil exactly as the moon reflects the light of the sun.

νερτέρων ἐπίσκοπε: See 10.3–5.

25–44 Here starts the sequence of epithets, possibly a later interpolation. Many are *hapax legomena*, or adjectives not normally used as divine epithets – those whose reading is mainly conjectural will not be taken into consideration. They allude to different aspects of the goddess, the majority of which can be traced back to her traditional characteristics (see 10.3–5). For the sake of convenience they have been arranged below according to categories (in bold type), though sometimes

⁹⁹ See 10.4; Morenz 1975; Faraone 1999, 35; Anubis with the key on magical amulets, DD 90, nos. 115, 122 (cf. Bonner 1950, 254 no. 8).

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Luc. *Philops.* 14.25, where Cerberus appears with Hecate during the performance of a love spell.

¹⁰¹ Plu. *De facie* 929a.5–930d.11 especially.

¹⁰² Parmenid. fr. 14.3 (Diels and Kranz); also Emped. fr. 45.2 (Diels and Kranz); Cleomedes, 2.5.81–6.

¹⁰³ Plu. *De facie* 942d6–11.

overlaps are unavoidable. The numbers in brackets refer to the line in which the epithets appear.

A. Lunar nature: αἰπή (25), πορφυρέη (28), φαεννώ (31), διχθᾶς (32),¹⁰⁴ αὐτοφυής (33),¹⁰⁵ Μήνη (36, see line 23), ἡγκαλισμένη ἀκτῖνας (36–7), ἀγλαή (39), χρυσῶπι (42),¹⁰⁶ ἀκτινοχαῖτι (44).¹⁰⁷

Θοή (25): Thoe is mentioned by Hesiod as one of the Nereids, or of the Oceanids,¹⁰⁸ but here the word seems to be used as an adjective referring to the lunar cycle, probably chosen because it was frequently used to qualify the night.¹⁰⁹

χρυσοστεφῇ (30): The epithet is often used for Aphrodite, but not exclusively.¹¹⁰ Here it refers to the light of the moon as it does in the *Homeric Hymn* to Selene.¹¹¹

τερψίμβροτε (42): Traditionally, an epithet of Helios referring to the light of the sun,¹¹² here used for the light of the moon.

B. Chthonic, dangerous and vengeful nature: ὀλκῖτι φασγάνων (26),¹¹³ νύσσα (28), σκοτεῖη (29), ὄξυβόη (35)¹¹⁴ and λιγ{γ}εῖα (41, see 12.8–9).

στηλῖτι (35): ‘Placarded as infamous’ (LSJ), but possibly also ‘tombal’, referring to Hecate as leader of ghosts, or ‘like a boundary post’, referring to Hecate’s protection of the *limen*.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁴ Possibly referring to the multiple-sided nature of the moon or alluding to Hecate’s connection with the deities of fate (see 10.14–16, κυρία), cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.411.

¹⁰⁵ Synonym of αὐτογένηθος, see 1.32, here referring to the regeneration symbolized by the moon phases.

¹⁰⁶ Normally for the light of the sun, cf. e.g. Eur. *El.* 740; Cornut. 67.1.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. *HH* 32.3–4. ¹⁰⁸ Hes. *Th.* 245, 354.

¹⁰⁹ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 10.394, 468, 12.463, 14.261, *Od.* 12.284; Hes. *Th.* 481; used as divine epithet, e.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.430, 8.215; *HH* 19.29; Ps.-Manetho, *Apotel.* 6.505.

¹¹⁰ E.g. *HH* 6.1; Hes. fr. 26.13 (Merkelbach and West); Sappho, fr. 33.1 (Lobel and Page).

¹¹¹ *HH* 32.6. ¹¹² Hom. *Od.* 12.269, 274; *HH* 3.411.

¹¹³ Cf. lines 6–10.

¹¹⁴ Of birds, Aesch. *Ag.* 57; Dionys. *Ixent.* 3.18.1.

¹¹⁵ LSJ, στήλη, II.1, 4.

χαροπή (35): Used mainly for animals, especially lions, but also dogs and serpents (see 10.30, 5).¹¹⁶ Alternatively, in its meaning ‘bluish-grey’, it could refer to the moonlight (see 15.4).

C. Assimilation with other deities: λοφαίη (26),¹¹⁷ παιωνία (27),¹¹⁸ Ἰδαῖα (34).¹¹⁹

ποδάρκη (28): Standard epithet of Achilles, but also, in the forms ποδώκης and ποδόρρωρος, of the Arcadian huntress Atalanta, protégée of Artemis.¹²⁰ Apart from these connections it could have been chosen to describe the quick orbit of the moon.

ἀλκίμη (28): Standard epithet of heroes and often of Heracles,¹²¹ it can also be found with warrior goddesses especially Athena.¹²²

Περσία (30): Either a surname of Artemis in Lydia¹²³ or a patronymic of Hecate daughter of Perses for Περσηίς¹²⁴ (see 10.3–5).

εὐστοχε (32), εὐρύστοχε (39): Even if they are not attested as epithets of Artemis, the terms seem to refer to this goddess as skilled archeress – like ἰοχέαιρα at line 44.

μιτρίη (33): Possibly meaning ‘with a headband’, or deriving from Mitra, the Persian Aphrodite.¹²⁵

Δωδωνή (34): Δωδωναῖος is usually an epithet of Zeus because of his oracle in Dodona,¹²⁶ but here the choice of the term seems to be based on an assimilation between Hecate and

¹¹⁶ Richardson 2010, *ad* HH 4.194 (Vergados 2013, *ad loc.*); also Theocr. 25.142; AP 10.22.2.

¹¹⁷ Possibly from the crested helm of Athena.

¹¹⁸ Epithet of Athena, Paus. 1.2.5.8, 1.34.3.9.

¹¹⁹ Epithet of the Anatolian Mother Goddess: Roller 1999, 67, 206.

¹²⁰ E.g. Hes. fr. 73.2, 76.5, 20 (Merkelbach and West); Callim. *Hym.* 3.215 (Bornmann 1968, *ad loc.*).

¹²¹ E.g. heroes: Hom. *Il.* *passim*. Heracles: Hes. *Th.* 526, 950; Pind. *Ol.* 10.44.

¹²² E.g. Soph. *Aj.* 401 *bis*; cf. HH 27.9 (Artemis).

¹²³ E.g. Plu. *Luc.* 24.4.3; Paus. 7.6.6.4–5.

¹²⁴ E.g. Apoll. Rhod. 3.467.

¹²⁵ Cf. Hdt. 1.132.1.

¹²⁶ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 16.233; Plato, *Phdr.* 275b5.

the goddess Dione, venerated in the same temple with Zeus at Dodona.¹²⁷

πανδώτειρα (38): In the *OH* it is an epithet of Nature, Gaea and Demeter as begetters of fruits (see 12.27–30, 15.32–6),¹²⁸ and of the Moirai as controllers of human fate.¹²⁹ Here it could underline both Hecate's chthonic nature and connection with Persephone/Demeter, and her assimilation with the goddesses of fate (see 10.14–16, κυρία).

Μινώα, λοχιάς (42), Θηβαία, τλητή (43): The epithet Minoan could refer to Pasiphae, the queen of Crete, sister of Circe and a powerful witch with lunar connotations.¹³⁰ Alternatively, it could allude to Ariadne, the daughter of Minos. Various versions of the myth tell us about the death of Ariadne,¹³¹ but Homer gives another detail: Odysseus sees her in the Underworld as she was slain by Artemis immediately after Theseus killed the Minotaur and fled away with her.¹³² Therefore, Ariadne could have been seen as one of the young women killed by Artemis that were assimilated with Hecate (see 10.3–5). As far as Θηβαία is concerned, it is unlikely to refer to Egyptian Thebes, and a cult of Hecate is not attested in Boeotian Thebes. However, the goddess could be called Theban because of her association with Core and Demeter, who had a sanctuary near the city gates where the Samothracian version of their mysteries was performed.¹³³ On the other hand, considering the presence of λοχιάς (below section **H**), both Minoan and Theban could refer to Eileithyia, the goddess of childbirth with whom both Artemis and Hecate were identified

¹²⁷ E.g. Demosth. *Ep.* 4.3.3; Strab. 7.7.12.4–5. See **II** n.34.

¹²⁸ Very similar to **πλουτοδότειρα**, 'giver of riches', epithet of Demeter in Hecat. Abd. *FGH* fr. 25.54; *OH* 40.3; Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.1 (Isis).

¹²⁹ *OH* 10.16, 26.2, 40.3, 59.18.

¹³⁰ Ps.-Apollod. 3.197.6–198.1; Paus. 3.26.10–11.

¹³¹ E.g. Arat. *Phaen.* 71–2; Paus. 2.23.8.1–4, 10.29.3.5–7 (Ariadne in the Underworld in Polygnotus' painting at Delphi); Plu. *Thes.* 20.5.4–6.1.

¹³² Hom. *Od.* 11.321–5.

¹³³ E.g. Paus. 9.25.5.1–3.

(cf. 10.3–5).¹³⁴ Eileithyia played an important part in the birth of Heracles at Thebes, and, according to a version of the myth, she was born in Crete.¹³⁵ If the whole section refers to Hecate as protectress of childbirth, even the final *τλητή* could find a better sense as ‘steadfast in the sufferings of labour’.

ιοχέαιρα (44): Traditional epithet of Artemis.¹³⁶

D. Control over fate: κλωθαίη (38, see 10.14–16, κυρία).

οὐλοή (35): It often qualifies the night and fate, especially μοῖρα (see 10.14–16, κυρία).¹³⁷

E. Hecate leader of ghosts: στρατηλάτι (33), ἰνδαλίμη (32),¹³⁸ κυνώ (37, see 10.30).

νεοπενθής (34): Possibly to be intended in a passive sense, meaning ‘recently mourned’, i.e. ‘dead’.

λυκώ (34): The epithet was probably chosen as a more evocative alternative to ‘bitch’ (see 10.30) since the wolf is a canid, but generally more dangerous than the dog and renowned for hunting at night thanks to its developed night vision.¹³⁹ It was considered a frightful predator and often connected with uncivilized savageness, and Mormo, a female child-killing bogey in Hecate’s train that can be identified with the goddess herself, could appear in the shape of a wolf, as testified by her name Μορμολύκη (cf. line 58 ἵππος).¹⁴⁰ As a

¹³⁴ E.g. Posidon. fr. 398.55 (Theiler); Diod. Sic. 5.72.5.2–3; Plu. *Quaest. conv.* 658ff6–659a2; *OH* 2.9, 12 (where Porthyraia is in her turn identified with Artemis); Aelian, *NA* 7.15.36; Euseb. *PE* 3.13.21.6; *Etymol. Gud. Add.* E 440.19–20; cf. also Paus. 2.22.7.5.

¹³⁵ Hom. *Il.* 19.96–105, *Od.* 19.188–9; Diod. Sic. 4.9.4.1–5.1; Strab. 10.4.8.1–2; Paus. 1.18.5; Ps.-Apollod. 2.53.3–8.

¹³⁶ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.53, 447, 6.428, *Od.* 6.102, 11.172; *HH* 2.424, 3.15, 9.2; Hes. *Th.* 14, 918; *OH* P.7, 35.4, 36.6.

¹³⁷ E.g. Moira: Hom. *Il.* 16.849, 21.83, *Od.* 2.100, 3.238, 19.145; Hes. *Op.* 745. Night: Hom. *Il.* 16.567, *Od.* 11.19; Hes. *Th.* 757; Apoll. Rhod. 4.1696.

¹³⁸ From ἰνδάλλομαι/ἰνδαλμα, possibly meaning ‘who can appear’ like in a dream, i.e. in ghostly form, cf. Luc. *Gall.* 5.18, 17–20.

¹³⁹ Cf. Aelian, *NA* 10.26.4–8.

¹⁴⁰ Johnston 1995b, especially 376–7; Johnston 1999, 161–83. On lycanthropy and the wolf’s connection with the Underworld as a devourer of corpses, Mainoldi 1984, especially 17–18, 28–30.

symbol of uncontrolled nature, the wolf also appears together with the lion (see line 59) in the *HH* to the Mother of gods, which may suggest an assimilation of Hecate with the Anatolian Mother Goddess in her aspect of *Potnia Theron*.¹⁴¹

F. Craftiness and wickedness: δαιδάλη (25),¹⁴² ἀτασθάλη (43).

δολόεσσα (43): Used for the two ‘witches’ Circe and Medea by Homer and Apollonius Rhodius respectively.¹⁴³

G. Androgyny: θυμάνδρεια (26), ἀνδρείη (33): Cf. 13.28A.

When the *OH* call Artemis ἀρσενόμορφος, ‘of masculine look’, and say of Athena that she is ‘female and male at the same time’, the goddesses seem to be described as bellicose and fearless huntress and warrior respectively, but when they say the same of Selene the reason cannot be just a poetic depiction of a masculine attitude.¹⁴⁴ Her androgyny seems to be connected with the lunar phases: the moon ‘waxes and wanes’, she is ‘male and female’, she has multiple forms, thus multiple genders.¹⁴⁵ On the other hand, the *PGM* seem to explain Hecate’s androgyny through her connection with Hermes: she is invoked as ‘Hecate, Hermes, Hermecate’ (merging the two names), and ‘Mene . . . Hermes and Hecate at the same time, male and female scion’, the only case of identification between deities of different genders.¹⁴⁶ The two

¹⁴¹ *HH* 14.4; Roller 1999, 122–3, 228; see II n.14. Also an Artemis λυκεῖη is attested at Troezen (but she may have been given the epithet as sister of Apollo, who can be λύκαιος; Graf 2009, 120–2, cf. Fontenrose 1988, 132), and λύκαινα is an epithet of Aphrodite in *OH* 55.11 (but probably thanks to an assimilation with Hecate-moon).

¹⁴² Cf. the frequency of the adjective δαίδαλος in Homer.

¹⁴³ Hom. *Od.* 9.32; Apoll. Rhod. 3.89.

¹⁴⁴ *OH* 36.7, 32.10, 9.4 (Ricciardelli 2000, *ad loc.*), cf. 42.4, 56.4, where similar descriptions apply to gods considered androgynous owing to their identification with the hermaphrodite Protogonus-Dionysus.

¹⁴⁵ Fauth 2006, 27–31; cf. Plato, *Smp.* 190b (for androgyny as connected to the moon); also Plu. *De Iside* 368c10.

¹⁴⁶ III 47–8; IV 2609–10 (13.27–8A).

deities were already associated,¹⁴⁷ but never identified, as they shared some important functions: mainly the protection of the *limen* and the ability of crossing between worlds – thus the role of the psychopomp. As mediators between the realm of the dead and of the living, the ‘outside’ and the ‘inside’, they could easily be seen in between ‘the male’ and ‘the female’. Moreover, in the Egyptian tradition the lunar deity *par excellence* was male: Thoth, in his turn identified with Hermes thanks to various shared functions.¹⁴⁸ Also, the deity protecting the transition from life to death was male: Anubis, again merged with Hermes in the deity Hermanubis¹⁴⁹ but also associated with Hecate thanks to his ‘canine’ nature and his role of doorkeeper of the Underworld. In conclusion, Hecate’s androgynous essence seems to have been already inherent in her lunar/mediating nature and in her association with Hermes, but it is likely to have been strengthened by a superimposition of the Egyptian tradition.¹⁵⁰ When Plutarch said that the Egyptians ‘think that she (the moon) has a nature both male and female, as she is receptive and made pregnant by the sun, but she herself in turn emits and disseminates into the air generative principles’,¹⁵¹ this superimposition had already taken place.

¹⁴⁷ E.g. Hes. *Th.* 444; Porph. *De abst.* 2.16.30, *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* 8.108–9; cf. Alexis, *PCG* fr. 93.

¹⁴⁸ Boylan 1922, especially 62–8; Derchain-Urtel 1981, 136–46; Stadler 2009b, especially 34–5, 200–19. For an Egyptian example of a female form of Thoth see Von Lieven 2007, 193–5.

¹⁴⁹ Grenier, *LIMC* ‘Hermanubis’; Kákosy 1990; Stadler 2009b, 439.

¹⁵⁰ It appears rather problematic to talk about androgynous deities in Egyptian religion before the Ptolemaic period: see Ward 1972, 154–7; however, for possible androgynous lunar and solar deities in Egyptian magic cf. e.g. Sandman-Holmberg 1946, 31–5; see Zandee 1992 on the possible androgynous connotation of Egyptian creator gods (especially Atum); also Baines 1985, especially 118–22; Kákosy 1999, 86 (III.2), 100 (X+IV.2), 134 (fig. 25). For androgynous traits in monstrous figures such as Echidna see Strauss Clay 1993, especially 106, 110.

¹⁵¹ Plu. *De Iside* 368c.9–368d.2.

H. Hecate's Hesiodic traits: πρόσβειρα (31): Perhaps only 'venerable', or possibly 'old', referring to her Titanic nature (see 10.3–5).¹⁵²

πελαγίη (31): The term is found as an epithet of Aphrodite (due to the myth of her birth),¹⁵³ other gods,¹⁵⁴ and especially Isis, possibly owing to her role as the pilot of the solar bark in Egyptian tradition.¹⁵⁵ However, it could also refer to Hecate's authority over the sea (see 10.3–5).

βαριδοῦχε (32): Possibly a reference to her role as helper of sailors.¹⁵⁶

λοχιάς (42): The epithet λοχεία/λοχία is typical of Artemis as helper during childbirth,¹⁵⁷ and Hecate obtained it through her identification with Artemis. However, the Hesiodic Hecate was already κουροτρόφος; thus, even if with a different lexical choice, the epithet still expresses one of the traditional functions of the goddess (see 10.3–5).

I. Specific names: Βριμώ (29): The 'angry, terrifying one', can be used for various deities but mainly for Hecate.¹⁵⁸

Ἀλκυόνη (30): Alcyone was one of the Pleiades, the daughters of Atlas, or, according to a different version of the myth, a group of virgin companions of Artemis that Zeus placed in the sky in the homonymous constellation. The appearance of Alcyone could be due either to her 'starry' nature, or to her connection with Artemis.

¹⁵² Epithet of Nature in *OH* 10.2 (cf. 12.27–30).

¹⁵³ E.g. Artemid. *Oniocr.* 2.37.116–17.

¹⁵⁴ E.g. Plu. *Septem* 161d2.

¹⁵⁵ Bricault 1996, 60; Kockelmann 2008, 58; Tran Tam Tinh, *LIMC* 'Isis', IV.D; Griffiths 1975, 31–47; Merkelbach 1995, 66; Leclant 1986, 346–9; Dunand 1973b, 94–5; Bruneau 1961 and 1963.

¹⁵⁶ Hes. *Th.* 440–4.

¹⁵⁷ Eur. *Supp.* 958; *IT* 1097; Plu. *Quaest. conv.* 658f6–659a2; D.Chrys. *Or.* 7.135.2; Artemid. *Oniocr.* 2.35.14–16; Ael. Arist. *Eiς Δία* 7.17, *Ἀθηνᾶ* 23.30–1; *OH* 36.3; Aelian, *NA* 7.15.36; Porph. *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* 8.55. Kruse, *RE* 'Locheia'.

¹⁵⁸ E.g. Lycophr. 1176; Apoll. Rhod. 3.861–2, 1211; Luc. *Nec.* 20.17–18.

J. Generic: πολυκλείτη (27),¹⁵⁹ ἄμβροτε (29), ἐπήκοε (29),¹⁶⁰ δολιχή (38),¹⁶¹ ἁγία (40, see 9.11, cf. 4.1, 3), ἀφθίτη (40), παρθένε (44, see 10.3–5).

σώτειρα (37): Common epithet of various goddesses underlining their role as ‘deliverers’, whether in an eschatological context or not,¹⁶² and also typical of Isis.¹⁶³ Hecate could have obtained it from her identification with Artemis and the function of protectress of childbirth that she shared with this goddess. At the same time, she could be called σώτειρα because of the mysteries that were performed in her honour at Aegina, or thanks to her assimilation with Core and the role she played in the Eleusinian mysteries in connection with eschatological salvation.¹⁶⁴ The epithet is especially attested for Hecate at Lagina in Caria, where she seems to have been the equivalent of Cybele in Phrygia: a benefactress, Mother Goddess (cf. 10.3–5, 11.59).¹⁶⁵

¹⁵⁹ Cf. the similar epithets πολύμνος and πολύαινος, ‘renowned’, e.g. *HH* 26.7; Maiistas, 1, 65 (Sarapis): see Engelmänn 1975, 26, 57, lines 30, 94.

¹⁶⁰ Possibly referring to the lunar nature of the goddess (see 1.9, 7.19), or to Artemis-Hecate as the one who listens to prayers in connection with her role of helper/deliverer during childbirth: see Kraus 1960, 163, 169 no. 4b; cf. Dunand 1973b, 187 footnote 4. Cf. III 256 for ἐπήκοος in the fragmentary hymn to Apollo (see *Intro.* p. 54); see also 7.19.

¹⁶¹ Possibly like δολιχαίων, ‘immortal’.

¹⁶² E.g. Pind. *Ol.* 12.2 (Tyche); Aristoph. *Ra.* 379 (Demeter); Plato, *Lg.* 960c.8 (Atropos); Lycurg. *In Leocr.* 17.11 (Athena); Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.26 (Isis, Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.*); Paus. 1.40.2.4–3.6, 1.44.4.7, 2.31.1.2, etc. (Artemis), 3.13.2.7, 8.31.1.5 (Core); *OH* 2.14 (Prothyraia/Hecate), 14.8 (Rhea), 27.12 (Mother of the gods), 36.13 (Artemis). E.g. *IG* VII.2234, *IG* XII.3.1328 (Artemis Enodia).

¹⁶³ Bricault 1996, 67–8; Merkelbach 1995, 66–7, 98; Dunand 1973b, 28–9, 103; Sfameni Gasparro 2002, 327–42; e.g. *OGIS* 184; Bernand and Bernand 1969, no. 59.

¹⁶⁴ Also as identified with the Great Mother in Anatolia: see Laumonier 1958, 420–1.

¹⁶⁵ For attestations and discussion, Laumonier 1958, 420–1; Kraus 1960, 44.

κυδίμη (38): As a typical epithet of Hermes (see 7.3), it could have been attributed to Hecate because of her connection with this god (above section **G**).

ἄνασσα (39): A generic epithet (cf. 1.1) that can be found with various deities including Hecate, called ἄνασσα already in the *Homeric Hymn* to Demeter. Also frequently attested for Isis.¹⁶⁶

ἄρηγέ (39): The verb ἄρήγω is often found especially in the *Iliad* in connection with the helping actions of various gods.¹⁶⁷

θαλία (41): Possibly used to denote a young god/goddess; cf. θάλος in the *OH*.¹⁶⁸ Alternatively, it could be the name of Thalia,¹⁶⁹ one of the three Charites, Graces, chosen as a member of a group of ‘three’ deities and thanks to the connection between Hecate and the Charites (see 15.6–7).

λυπαροπλόκαμε (41): A very rare epithet, used by Homer for Ate, the personification of madness, ruin and inconsiderate action – later virtually identified with Erinyes – whom Zeus cast out from Olympus.¹⁷⁰ Interestingly, the similar compound λυπαροκρήδεμνος, ‘with bright headband’, is an epithet of Hecate in the *Homeric Hymn* to Demeter.¹⁷¹

πανγαίη (37): It could refer either to Hecate’s lunar nature in the sense of ‘embracing all the earth’, or to her chthonic nature as ‘who is in all the earth’ (as opposed to the sky), or to her widespread worship.

45 See lines 25–44, **F** and **J** (σώτειρα).

¹⁶⁶ E.g. *HH* 2.75, 492 (Demeter), 440 (Hecate), 32.17 (Selene); Aesch. *Eu.* 288 (Athena); Eur. *El.* 678 (Gaia), *IT* 1230 (Artemis), *Ph.* 686 (Demeter), *IA* 1482, 1523 (Artemis); Soph. *Aj.* 774 (Athena); Aristoph. *Th.* 123 (Leto), *Ra.* 385 (Demeter); Apoll. Rhod. 3.862, 4.147 (Hecate). Isis: e.g. Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.1, 19, 2.29, 3.1, 19; see Bricault 1996, 14; Kockelmann 2008, 50.

¹⁶⁷ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 5.507 (Ares), 5.511 (Athena), 12.68 (Zeus), 16.701 (Apollo).
¹⁶⁸ *OH* 29.5 (Persephone), 36.11 (Artemis), 50.3 (Dionysus), 56.8 (Adonis), 67.6 (Asclepius); see also 2.22A and **I** n.214.

¹⁶⁹ Hes. *Th.* 906–8; Pind. *Ol.* 14.13–16; *OH* 60.3.

¹⁷⁰ Hom. *Il.* 19.126.

¹⁷¹ *HH* 2.25, 438.

46–7 In the magical hymns analysed, this is the only case in which the magician directly identifies himself with a deity, following a procedure typical of Egyptian magic.¹⁷² To strengthen his statement about his secret knowledge, he pretends to be Hermes the elder, i.e. Hermes-Thoth, the magician *par excellence*.¹⁷³ The Egyptian instances in which Thoth is mentioned as the father of Isis are very few, and late,¹⁷⁴ thus it seems more probable that the two gods were connected in this way just because Isis was considered a great magician too.¹⁷⁵ If the hymn underlies an identification Hecate-Isis (cf. lines 53–5), the magician could state his paternity of the goddess in order to stress his predominance in knowledge and control, but the text does not seem to point in this direction.

48 One of the symbols of the deity is her secret name,¹⁷⁶ see **10.3**, βορβοροφόρβα, 14–16, νεβουτοσουαληθ, and here 25–44, **I**, βριμώ.

49 See lines 90–4.

¹⁷² See **Intro**. n.59; also Betz 1991, 248–9; Ritner 1995b, 51; Quack 1996, 309–10. Even in the *PGM*, in most cases the magician identifies himself with an Egyptian deity: e.g. I 251–2, IV 126 (Coptic), 1075–8, V 247, XII 234, XXXVI 317–18.

¹⁷³ Boylan 1922, 124–35.

¹⁷⁴ DMamm. 90; D II 221; also in an unpublished Demotic narrative text (P. Carlsberg 621, second century AD) and at IV 94–106. See Müller 1961, 21; cf. Stadler 2009b, 152–5.

¹⁷⁵ They shared the epithet ‘great of magic’, cf. *LGG* II.454–5 (*wr-hk3w* Funktionen A.i), II.493–6 (*wrt-hk3w* Funktionen A.a), cf. e.g. III.309–10 (*mmh-hk3w* Funktionen A.c); the same idea is possibly expressed in the aretologies that describe Isis as instructed by Thoth (e.g. *RICIS* 202/1801.10); cf. Plu. *De Iside* 352a9–352b4, 355f5–6. See Peek 1930, 31–4; Quaegebeur 1995, 177–81.

¹⁷⁶ Contrast Smith 1981, 649, who thinks the text has to be emended since the symbol must be the sandal as stated later on in the hymn. However, the sandal is certainly a symbol of the goddess but this does not mean that the author had to define it as such when first mentioned (he says it further on). The text can be kept as it is since the secret magical names are symbols of the goddess too. Cf. Addey 2011, 283–4.

50–1 The magician takes advantage of the natural phenomenon of the new moon, pretending to be the cause of it.

52 The word *ρόμβος* can be used for various spinning or whirling objects including the *ἰνyx*,¹⁷⁷ so that, especially in later sources, the two words can become synonyms.¹⁷⁸ At the same time, the cymbals were mainly employed in mystery cults and it seems that, together with other bronze percussion instruments, their symbolic function was to avert negative forces and protect from evil spirits.¹⁷⁹ The magical *ἰνyx* appears in descriptions of erotic magical procedures involving Hecate, and in general it has a ‘subduing’, ‘drawing’ power. Therefore, the magician is saying in other words ‘I am subduing you to my will through the means of magic, and I am not doing anything to keep the malignant powers of darkness at bay’.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁷ Quoting the definition of Gow 1934, 3: ‘A spoked wheel with two holes on either side of the centre. A cord is passed through one hole and back through the other; if the loop on one side of the instrument is held in one hand, the two ends (which it is convenient to join) in the other, and the tension alternately increased and relaxed, the twisting and untwisting of the cords will cause the instrument to revolve rapidly, first in one direction and then in the other’ especially used in erotic magic to attract the victim. *Iynx* was also a nymph who tried to seduce Zeus with magic – or, according to another version, made him fall in love with Io – and was punished by Hera, who transformed her into the *ἰνyx* bird, the wryneck (*Iynx torquilla*). The magical drawing power of the *ἰνyx* wheel has been explained through analogies with the behaviour of the *ἰνyx* bird (cf. **II** n.178), but more recently through the importance either of the wheel as an implement of torture (Faraone 1993) or of the sound produced by the spinning of the wheel as magical means of attraction (Johnston 1995a and 1990, 90–110 also for the connection between the *ἰνγες* and Hecate in the Chaldean theurgy). See also Segal 1973.

¹⁷⁸ Tavenner 1933; Gow 1934, 8–11; Nelson 1940, 450–3.

¹⁷⁹ Haldane 1966, 105–6; and especially Villing 2002, 289–92; on bronze implements beaten during eclipses to scare away spirits or avert impurity cf. Plu. *De facie* 944b2–6; *Scholia in Theocr.* 2.35/36a.11–16 (quoting the second century BC grammarian Apollodorus).

¹⁸⁰ The issue of the difference between the *ρόμβος* and the *ἰνγξ* is still controversial: Gow 1934 argues that *ρόμβος* always refers to the bullroarer, a ‘musical’ instrument (an oblong rectangular slat of wood tied to a cord that produces a sound when swung in circles in the air). Even if it were the case,

53-5 ‘The one of the Nile’ (feminine), or ‘the one (of the land) of the Nile’ (i.e. Egypt), is likely to be Isis, as Preisendanz pointed out.¹⁸¹ Here she seems to be identified with the moon goddess (see **Intro.** pp. 9-10, cf. 12.23): Hecate-moon is invited to look at herself (light), i.e. the beauty of ‘the Lady of the Nile’, and to admire this beauty of hers before she spits dark light from her eyes (before the total obscurity of the new moon). However, in the two other passages that mention Isis (lines 47, 98), she appears to be conceived as separate from the moon goddess. Of course Νειλώτις does not necessarily have to refer to Isis, but could imply something like γῆ or χθών, ‘land’ (as it does in Aesch. *Pr.* 814): the moon could be called ‘beauty of the land of the Nile’, implying an Egyptian setting. Otherwise, we could hypothesize that the expression ‘the beauty of the Lady of the Nile’, i.e. ‘the beauty of Isis’, alludes to a proverbial beauty, like saying ‘the beauty of Venus’. In any case, the whole phrase would mean: ‘when your light is visible you are extremely beautiful, and thus give a last look at this proverbial beauty of yours so that you can admire yourself a last time before the obscurity of the new moon overcomes you and I, thanks to my magical power, can have the possibility of taking away your beauty from you forever’.

the ῥόμβος appears as a magical object used for ‘attracting’ in erotic magic both in Theocr. 2.30 and Luc. *DMeretr.* 4.5.4, thus the interpretation of our phrase would not change. Moreover, exactly these two attestations, compared with those involving the *ἵνυξ*, strengthen the hypothesis that the two terms could be synonyms, as the specific object *ἵνυξ* could be included in the more general category ῥόμβος. When Smith 1981, 650, decides to follow Koenen’s suggestion of inserting δ’ before οὐχ ‘with the negation extending its force to the first colon’ since ‘if the magician were to swing the rhombus he would help frighten away the power of darkness, as he would if he shook the cymbals’, he seems to intend ῥόμβος as the bullroarer that was used in the mysteries (e.g. Eur. *Hel.* 1362-3), possibly with the same apotropaic function as the cymbals. But, considering that it also appears among the symbols of the goddess (see line 92), it is more likely to be an *ἵνυξ*: following this interpretation there is no need to emend the reading.

¹⁸¹ *AP Epigr. sepulcr.* 519.2: Νειλώτιδος Ἰσιδος.

58 ἵππος: Very few or late sources connect Hecate with the horse (cf. **10.3–5**, **τρικάρανε** and **II n.33**): Hesiod describes her as protectress of horsemen;¹⁸² Theocritus calls ἵππος the child-killing demon Mormo (see lines 25–44, **E λυκώ**, and **15.53–4**);¹⁸³ and much later Porphyry tells us that the Persians called Hecate (the moon) ‘mare’ – as well as ‘bull, lioness and bitch’.¹⁸⁴ Hippiā, ‘of the horses’, was a typical title of Athena, but it alluded to the riding of the chariot and the breeding of horses, which seems to be out of context here. However, according to a myth, Demeter changed herself into a mare when trying to avoid being raped by Poseidon but was then deceived by the god who transformed himself into a horse. Angry and in mourning for the kidnapping of her daughter, she put on a black robe and hid in a cave, causing a standstill in the earth’s productivity. From the union of Demeter and Poseidon the horse Arion was born, and a daughter, Despoina, who seems to have played a role in the mysteries. In a variant of the myth, the mother of Arion is not Demeter but one of the Erinyes (worshipped in Tilphusa, Boeotia), which reminds us of the Gorgon Medusa, seduced by Poseidon, from whose severed head Chrysaor and the horse Pegasus were born. On the basis of these myths, at Phigalia and Thelpusa in Arcadia they worshipped a horse-headed Demeter Melaina, ‘black’,¹⁸⁵ and a Demeter-Erinyes respectively.¹⁸⁶ Various hypotheses have been suggested for the association of Demeter/Erinyes/Medusa with the

¹⁸² Hes. *Th.* 439.

¹⁸³ Theocr. 15.40; cf. Hippol. *Refut.* 4.35.5.7.

¹⁸⁴ Porph. *De abst.* 4.16.33; cf. Johnston 1990, 123.

¹⁸⁵ Owing to the colour of the robe, symbolizing the chthonic nature of the goddess. Remarkably, the Erinyes can be described as wearing black robes too: e.g. Aesch. *Eu.* 370, *Sept.* 699–700, *Ch.* 1049; Lycophr. 1136. Cf. Sarian 1986, 28.

¹⁸⁶ E.g. Paus. 8.25.4–9, 8.42.1–7, 9.33.1–30; Lycophr. 1040 and *Scholia* 153, 1038, 1040; Callim. fr. 652 (Pfeiffer); Ps.-Apollod. 3.77.6–8; *Scholia in Hom. Il.* 23.347; Hesych. A 7267. Burkert 1979, 125–9.

horse,¹⁸⁷ but considering that the cults mentioned above certainly stressed the chthonic traits of the goddess, the simplest solution might be the best. The point is still under debate, but the horse appears in funerary/Underworld contexts, and a series of myths and literary descriptions depict the untamed horse – in contrast with the harnessed – as a dangerous and almost demonic entity, which seems to imply that the horse had a chthonic aspect, even if it was not its main one.¹⁸⁸ In conclusion, the Hecate of our hymn could be called ‘mare’ thanks to her chthonic nature, her traditional connection with Demeter and, at the same time, her assimilation with the serpentine Erinyes and Gorgons.

Κόρη: See 10.4.

δράκαινα: The term is commonly used for female monstrous creatures with serpentine traits or a special fierceness,¹⁸⁹ and fits the assimilation between Hecate, the Erinyes and the Gorgons (see 10.5, cf. lines 90–4).

λαμπάς: Meaning ‘light’, ‘torch’, the term refers both to the lunar nature of the goddess and to her function of psychopomp torch-bearer (see 10.3–5).¹⁹⁰

ἀστραπή: The term could refer to the lightning as a powerful means of destruction, but more probably, considering what

¹⁸⁷ Mainly the connection of Demeter with Poseidon, the link between the horse and water as fundamental element for the growth of vegetation, an assimilation of Demeter with Artemis *Potnia Theron*, and the possible chthonic connotation of the horse. See Dietrich 1962; cf. Johnston 1992.

¹⁸⁸ For the whole discussion, Farnell 1896, III.50–64; Malten 1914; Dietrich 1962; Detienne and Verth 1971, especially 167–75; Johnston 1995b, 375–6; Johnston 1999, 258–64; cf. Kraus 1960, 80–1; Strauss Clay 1993, 109.

¹⁸⁹ *HH* 3.300; Plu. *De defect.* 414a11 (Pytho); Aesch. *Eu.* 127–8 (Erinyes); Eur. *IT* 285–7; Lycophr. 1114 (the ghost of Clytemnestra in her Erinys-like avenging wrath); Oppian, *Cyn.* 3.223 (Medusa); but cf. *OH* 32.11 (Athena). Cf. Sarian 1986, 28.

¹⁹⁰ The word might be capitalized, as the Lampades are attested as torch-bearing chthonic nymphs (cf. Alcman, *PMG* fr. 63); cf. Johnston 2014 for these nymphs in the Getty Hexameters and in connection with Hecate.

precedes and follows, it means ‘glare’ and alludes to the light of the moon.

59 ἄστήρ: Hecate-moon.

λέων: The Egyptian pantheon included various lion goddesses, first of all Sekhmet whose leonine features underlined her warlike, bloodthirsty and fierce nature. However, the solar Sekhmet and Hecate did not have anything else in common, so the latter seems more likely to have been called ‘lion’ because of the fierceness that the Greeks too attributed to this feline: it could be used to describe ‘monstrous’ creatures or human beings characterized by dangerousness and rage.¹⁹¹ Moreover, the lion was the preferred animal of the Phrygian Cybele and often appeared in connection with other Anatolian Mother Goddesses, thus Hecate could have obtained this attribute thanks to her association with Artemis *Potnia Theron* – in her turn identified with the Mother Goddess of Asia Minor – that was especially attested in the Anatolian territories where Hecate herself had a strong connection with this circle of Earth Mother feminine deities.¹⁹²

λύκαινα: See lines 25–44, **E**.

αἰωήη: See 3.33.

60–6 The magician lists various objects and ingredients that Smith suggested might be the secret symbols of the goddess, so that the personal pronoun **μου**, ‘my’ (lines 60, 67) should be changed to **σου**, ‘your’.¹⁹³ For some of the entries a sort of connection with Hecate can be found: the sieve (line 60) could

¹⁹¹ Especially the lioness: e.g. Anaxilas, *PCG* fr. 22.3–5 (with **δράκαινα**); Aesch. *Ag.* 1258; Eur. *Med.* 187, 1342, 1358, 1407, *El.* 1163, *Ba.* 990. Hecate ‘bull, dog and lioness’: Porph. *De abst.* 3.17.9–10.

¹⁹² Laumonier 1958, 409–12; cf. Kraus 1960, 29–37; Simon, *LIMC* ‘Kybele’, especially V.D, X–XI; Naumann 1983, e.g. 49–52, 233–4, 263–8 (see also **II** n.14); Roller 1999, 130–4, 148, and on the association between Artemis and the Phrygian Mother Goddess 127, 135–6; cf. the presence of lion traits or lions in the iconography of the Gorgons, Krauskopf, *LIMC* ‘Gorgo, Gorgones’, especially 317–19.

¹⁹³ Smith 1981, 650–1.

be a symbol of her chthonic nature acquired through her connection with Demeter/Core and the cultivation of cereals (possibly also the piece of bread at line 61); the hair of the virgin cow (line 62) could allude to Hecate's association with this bovine (see 12.23); the body of a bluish-shining woman (line 65) could refer to a corpse. The connection of the other entries with Hecate is rather obscure. What seems almost certain, however, is that the entries from 'hoof of a camel' to 'seed of Pan' (possibly also 'fire of a solar bolt'), should be encrypted names of plants (or stones/minerals), as plants are the ones that follow.¹⁹⁴ Dieleman analysed the list of magical ingredients appearing in XII 408–44 where every code name is given its everyday equivalent: a kind of nomenclature that seems to have originated within the Egyptian medico-magical priestly milieu.¹⁹⁵ We find denominations such as 'bone of an ibis' (=buckthorn), 'hairs of a baboon' (=dill seed), lion's hair (= 'tongue' of a turnip), or 'semen of Hermes' (=dill), and so on.¹⁹⁶ Even if our ingredients are not elsewhere decrypted, the similarities in pattern with these 'secret names' and the proximity with other botanical terms suggest that a similar contrivance was employed to disguise more mundane ingredients.

Furthermore, considering the entries as plants, the appearance of the first-person possessive pronoun (lines 60, 67) does not create any problem and it does not need to be emended. In lines 58–9 the magician would invoke Hecate with some

¹⁹⁴ Although they could also have an alternative meaning; three of them appear in Dioscorides, *De mat.* (4.60, 3.17.1/4.73.1, 2.167) as plants, which suggests they should be intended this way (παίδερος is uncertain since, apart from acanthus, it can be used for chervil, and also for a kind of opal, LSJ, 1b, c, 2).

¹⁹⁵ Dieleman 2005, 189–203; also Quack 1996, especially 311–14.

¹⁹⁶ We find also e.g. 'blood of a snake' (=haematite) and 'blood of a goose' (=mulberry tree's 'milk'), but the 'blood of turtle-dove' of our hymn was actually employed as a medicament (e.g. Dioscorides, *De mat.* 2.79.1, *Eupor.* 1.37.1, 1.43.1), thus it is not certain that it should be considered as an encrypted name too.

of her epithets, then in lines 60–6 he would list a series of ingredients and objects that he is using in the magical ritual, and not the symbols of the goddess. We know that the *κόσκι-von* could be used to sieve ingredients for medical preparations¹⁹⁷ and was also employed for divination.¹⁹⁸ Furthermore, the piece of bread, the coral, the blood and the plants are more likely to be the ingredients of a magical mixture (perhaps to be burnt) than the symbols of the goddess. Of course, the last two entries would remain obscure, but they are equally puzzling as symbols of the goddess. We could imagine that the magician is using an actual female corpse during the procedure (probably a little extreme), or that the phrase alludes to a wax figurine; but *γλαυκῆς* could be a mistake for *γλαυκός*,¹⁹⁹ ‘owl’, and the phrase could refer to the opened-out body of a female owl.²⁰⁰ Similarly, the magician may use ‘the pierced vagina of a sphinx-ape’, but the papyrus has *θεωρουμενη* which makes me wonder if something like *ἡ φύσις τ’ οὐρουμένη*, ‘the urinated substance of a black sphinx-ape’, was originally intended.

When the magician opens and closes the list with ‘this is/ these are my symbol(s)’, he uses *σύμβολον*, but when he finally lists the symbols of the goddess (lines 90–4) he uses *σημεῖον*. It is true that in the *PGM* the two words seem to be interchangeable for ‘secret signs’ of the gods,²⁰¹ but we could hypothesize that here the terms retained part of their original meaning. Thus, the magician could differentiate between two kinds of symbols: *σύμβολον*, ‘my secret token’ (‘everything

¹⁹⁷ E.g. Dioscorides, *De mat.* 2.108.2, 4.150.3, 5.18.1; Gal. *De compos. passim*.

¹⁹⁸ E.g. Philippides, *PCG* fr. 38; Theocr. 3.31; Luc. *Alex.* 9.15–16; Artemid. *Onirocr.* 2.69.11.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Pr apparatus *ad loc.*; *γλαύκη* for *γλαύξ* in Ps.-Caesarius, *Quest.* 146.181.

²⁰⁰ LSJ, γυνή IV.

²⁰¹ Even here 48, 79; e.g. III 499, 535, 624, IV 559, 945 (5.7), VII 560, 786; though in III 701 *σύμβολα* could be used for a list of ritual ingredients; cf. Smith 1981, 649–50; Addey 2011, 283–4.

that is ritually needed to fulfil the procedure'), i.e. 'the things that will grant me access to you, my safe-conduct'; and *σημεῖον*, 'your secret token' ('what distinguishes you'), i.e. your 'emblems'. Interpreting this section as a list of ritual ingredients would also explain why this spell consists only of the hymn and does not have a *praxis*: part of the *praxis* is included in the hymn.

68–73 Sauneron²⁰² showed that 'cosmic disorder' threats of this kind have a long history in Egyptian tradition – like the possibility of threatening the gods (see 11.11–16). In the magical papyrus Harris we find 'I will cause the land to descend into the primeval water, and the south to be made into north, and the earth to be reversed';²⁰³ in the *Book of the Dead* the deceased threatens, 'Hapi (the inundation) shall not ascend to the sky that he may live on truth, nor shall Re (the sun) descend to the waters that he may live on fish';²⁰⁴ in the papyrus Chester Beatty V, 'If you do not listen to my words, I will turn over the sky.'²⁰⁵ Similarly here, the light of the moon will be hidden by the sun, i.e. it will always be daylight, and Tethys, the Titan goddess of water, will flood the earth. Moreover, even if the Titan Cronus running away to Hades echoes the confinement of the Titans into the Tartarus after their defeat by Zeus and the Olympians,²⁰⁶ his appearance here must be due to his early identification with Chronus, 'Time'.²⁰⁷ As the threat focuses on 'stopping time', it is said that the frightened Cronus, defeated, fled to Hades, i.e. time is no longer moving, is 'dead'.

74 See lines 6–10.

75–6 It has been suggested that this phrase should be heavily emended as generally in the *PGM* it is 'magic that compels

²⁰² Sauneron 1951; also Assmann 2001a, 68–73; Quack 2002, 55–6.

²⁰³ Leitz 1999, BM EA 10042 VII.3–4. ²⁰⁴ *BoD* 65.11–12.

²⁰⁵ Verso 5.4. See also Sauneron 1970, 1.1 and (a).

²⁰⁶ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 8.478–81; Hes. *Th.* 715–21.

²⁰⁷ Waser, *RE* 'Chronos' 2; López Ruiz 2010, 158–64. On Cronus re-imagined as a powerful Underworld god in magical spells see Faraone 2010, especially 400–5.

gods, not vice versa'.²⁰⁸ It is true that magic compels the gods, but it compels them in order to make them do something: send a daimon, prophesy, destroy an enemy, etc., i.e. fulfil the spells through their divine power. If the performer's magic were sufficient, he would not even need to invoke the gods. Therefore, the phrase is already coherent: 'the world will be turned upside down; you will remain forever in darkness unless you help me to fulfil the spell as quickly as possible'.

78–9 Cf. lines 60–6. If the goddess surrenders now to the magician's requests she will not have to hear the symbols. Here *σύμβολα* could refer either to the previous list of ingredients or to the following list of symbols of the goddess (lines 90–4).²⁰⁹ In both cases, hearing them would be an unpleasant experience for the goddess since both lists testify to the secret knowledge of the magician thanks to which he will succeed in compelling her.

81 It is the 'fate' of the perpetual new moon status.

83–5 The magician blocked the moon goddess in her new moon phase by preventing time from passing for her (she is bound in Cronus' chains, see lines 68–73, and **15.37–41**). At line 84 the papyrus has been emended in different ways. Among them, the closer to the papyrus reading is Bonner's *καὶ Σφιγγὸς ἀνάγκη*, 'with the compulsion of the Sphinx' (see apparatus). A reference to the Sphinx as 'the throttle, the monster of the deadly grip' is then more probable, especially since the mention of the sphinx-ape at line 66 could be based on the same mythological allusion. However, such a reference can also be implied in the use of words of the same root, and thus I prefer *καὶ σφίγξει ἀνάγκη(ς)* as even closer to the papyrus reading, though not metrical. Three other passages in the *PGM* mention the gesture of holding the thumbs, and in all three cases it has to be performed by the magician as a

²⁰⁸ Smith 1981, 651–2.

²⁰⁹ Neither of them is repeated backwards, but the papyrus has *ἄνωθεν εἰς ἄνωθεν*, which could be an idiom for 'over and over again': Smith 1981, 652.

protective action.²¹⁰ when he is holding his own thumbs he cannot be affected by the deities/daimons. Whatever the gesture looked like,²¹¹ its purpose was the same as ‘keeping one’s fingers crossed’: the magician is holding the thumbs of the goddess to prevent her from doing it and thus protect herself. **86–7** Cf. lines 46–7. Since the magician previously identified himself with Hermes, it is to him – as Hermes – that the goddess promised to contribute.

88–9 The passage seems to imply the imagery that describes the sun and the moon as the eyes of the supreme deity (see 1.9, 3.18) somehow reproducing the same ambivalence shown by the double meaning of *τηλεσκόπε* (see 7.13). The *parallelismus membrorum* resembles some Egyptian expressions found in magical literature such as ‘you (the eye of Horus) see Re and Re sees you’.²¹²

90–4 Lines 90–1 are to be found also in LXX 9–11, *Suppl.* 49 57–9 and, partially, in Marcellus Empiricus, *De medicamentis* 15.89.²¹³ From the context of these parallels it would seem that these verses belonged to a separate hymn dealing with eschatological salvation and possibly connected with the Demetrian mysteries.²¹⁴ We saw that *PGM* LXX 12 and *Suppl.* 49 64–70 are paralleled in the lead tablet of the Getty Museum dated to fifth/fourth century BC (see **Intro.** pp. 34–5), which suggests that even our lines 90–1 could have a long history of transmission and derive from the the same background of mystery cults. However, in our hymn the eschatological allusions are missing and other entries are added to the list (lines 92–4). Thus, whatever the original background, the two verses in question seem to have been adapted to fit a different context where the possession of secret knowledge no longer serves as a means of

²¹⁰ XXXVI 163, LXIX 3, LXX 6.

²¹¹ On the subject see Bonner 1930; Gross, *RAC* ‘Finger’, A.I.8.

²¹² Roccati 1970, 29; cf. Quack 2006b, 59. ²¹³ Cf. VII 785.

²¹⁴ Cf. *Suppl.* page 203; for parallels and discussion, Dieterich 1911, 101–3; Jordan 1988, 255–6; Jordan 2001, 190–1.

salvation by the goddess, but as a means of compulsion of the goddess.

As far as the symbols are concerned, the key (see 10.4) – and the lock with three holes – the dark dog (see 10.30) and the iron magic wheel (see line 52) are typically connected with Hecate, as already seen. The wreath remains generic without knowing the material it was made of, while the herald's wand is a traditional attribute of Hermes that the goddess could have obtained through the connection with this deity (see lines 25–44, **G**). The burning altar seems to imply that burnt offerings were involved in the procedure, while 'darkness' and 'abyss' could echo the Underworldly abode of the goddess, and 'flame' her traditional torches (see 10.3–5). Finally, Porphyry²¹⁵ explains that the lunar goddess Hecate would have different attributes according to the three phases of the moon: the white robe, the golden sandal and the torches would symbolize the new moon, the basket (alluding to the produce of the land) the waxing phase, and the bronze sandal the full moon. Wortmann, also referring to the parallels in question, argues that the golden and bronze sandals were originally symbols of the *anodos* (from the new moon onwards) and *kathodos* (from the full moon onwards) of Persephone-Core in connection with the growing and harvesting period respectively. They would have been attributed also to Hecate thanks to her association with Demeter/Core and to her lunar nature, ending up as symbols of her benevolent (maiden torch-bearer) and chthonic (mistress of Tartarus) aspects respectively.²¹⁶

Certainly, the mention of only one sandal belongs to that recognized mythical pattern in which various ambulatory asymmetries represent a symbolic death, a previous *katabasis*, and thus a strong relationship with the Underworld.²¹⁷

²¹⁵ Porph. *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* 8.58–65.

²¹⁶ Wortmann 1967; Fauth 1985–86.

²¹⁷ First discussed by Lévi-Strauss: see Brelich 1955–57; Needham 1980; Vernant 1988; cf. Cassin 1987, especially 294–315; Ginzburg 1995, 206–51.

Furthermore, the sandal is made of bronze, a metal traditionally associated with the realm of the dead.²¹⁸ Therefore, Hecate could have been given this symbol even without the mediation of Persephone. At the same time, our hymn and the explanation of Porphyry seem to have a common background, since, when the magician says ‘I hid your sandal’ (line 49), he could refer to the light of the moon that he confined to darkness. Alternatively, the sandal could be conceived as the key: as an indispensable object without which the goddess is unable to cross the boundary of the Underworld. The magician hid it, thus Hecate cannot rise from the darkness of Hades (new moon).

94–5 σημάντρια: The term can mean both ‘leader’ and ‘herdsman’, ‘guide’. Considering that it is not otherwise attested in the *PGM*, where numerous expressions for ‘ruler’ or ‘leader’ are found, it seems more likely that here it is used in the meaning of ‘guide’, referring to the traditional psychopomp function of Hecate.

φοβούσα Ἐρινός: Cf. 10.17–18. Hecate is so dreadful that she frightens even the monstrous Erinyes.

96–8 As in 10.12, the victim is accused of impiety; this time he/she is the enemy of Helios-Osiris – i.e. Re-Osiris (see 1.20–1) – and Isis. Looking at the Greek, there is no sign of an identification Hecate-Isis, and Helios-Osiris and Isis seem to be mentioned only as supreme deities *par excellence*.

100–1 ὀνόματα σεμνά probably refers to the long series of *voces magicae* at the end of the hymn.²¹⁹ For the first time in the hymns it is openly stated that the knowledge of the names is fundamental for taking control of the deity: a typical Egyptian procedure.²²⁰

²¹⁸ Dieterich 1911, 102; Hades’ threshold is made of bronze: Hom. *Il.* 8.15; Hes. *Th.* 811; Soph. *OC* 1590–1; it has a fence and gates of bronze: Hes. *Th.* 726, 732–3; the Erinyes has hooves of bronze in Soph. *El.* 491.

²¹⁹ Cf. Soph. *OC* 41: the σεμνὸν ὄνομα is the name of the Erinyes, the σεμναὶ θεαί, see 14.8 σεμνή.

²²⁰ See **Intro.** n.59 and n.127.

CONCLUSIONS

101-3 The moon was thought to influence the production of dew, and moisture in general, thus to be in a sympathetic correspondence with easy labour and delivery, with physiological 'increases' and 'decreases' in bodily humours, and with some natural phenomena, especially tides.²²¹

CONCLUSIONS

The constant references to the *praxis* leave no doubt the hymn was composed *ad hoc* in a magical milieu. Similarly, the structure somehow escapes the traditional subdivisions, since the composition as a whole is a protracted threat continuously referring to the situation experienced by the goddess at the moment of the ritual action (new moon), and to the role of the magician in the magical procedure he is performing. We can recognize the *epiclēsis* (lines 1-5), and what would correspond to the *euchē* (lines 6-23), since, even if the passage is full of ritual details, the magician is stating what he would want from the deity. Then, we find a second *epiclēsis* (lines 24-45), and a second 'pseudo *euchē*' (lines 46-103) including the 'apex of the threat' (lines 68-94). The only section that may be disentangled from the rest as a later interpolation seems to be the long string of epithets in lines 25-44, rich in Homeric vocabulary.

Many of the magical procedures underlying this hymn belong to Egyptian magic: the possibility of threatening the god thanks to priestly knowledge (see lines 11-16); the identification of the magician with a deity (see lines 46-7); the threat of cosmic disorder (see lines 68-73); the importance of the knowledge of secret names (see lines 100-1). At the same time, some conceptions and magical practices are well attested in Greek

²²¹ Alcman, *PMG* fr. 57.1 (Dew is the daughter of Selene); Chrysipp. fr. log. 1013.9-12 (von Arnim); Posidon. fr. 10.7-13 (Theiler); Ps.-Aristot. *De mundo* 396a25-7; Plu. *Quaest. conv.* 658e5-659c2, *Aet. phys.* 917f8-918a6, *De facie* 939e9-940b3; Ptolem. *Apotel.* 2.13.8.1-9.1; Ps.-Galenus, *De victus* 19.189.1.8.

tradition: the idea that demonic entities were more dangerous and active during the new moon and the role of Cerberus doorkeeper of the Underworld (see lines 17–21); the use of the *ρόμβος* (see lines 52, 92).

On the other hand, as far as the nature of the deity invoked is concerned, the situation is similar to 10. This time, the stress is on the lunar aspect of Hecate, which, though probably a later development in the nature of the goddess (see 10.3–5 *τρικάρανε*), is totally in line with Greek religious conceptions. In fact, it is constantly connected with the chthonic aspect (e.g. lines 1, 82 *ταρταροῦχε*, 17–21, 50–2, 90–4) in an imagery that associates the moon, the night, the earth and femininity. In Egypt the male lunar Thoth was both a great magician and a psychopomp god,²²² but, though playing a role in the Netherworld, he was not identified with Osiris and did not become a ‘ruler of the Underworld’ and its demons. On the contrary, it was the solar god who was identified with the king of the dead Osiris.

Furthermore, most of the epithets employed fit the image of Hecate-Selene²²³ and, even when they remain obscure, they do not seem to imply any specific Egyptian background. Some of them could allude to Hecate’s identification with Thoth-Hermes or Isis (see general Conclusions),²²⁴ but even in this case they do not convey any theological conception that could lie outside Greek religious thought. Even if in 53–5

²²² Boylan 1922, 136–41; cf. Stadler 2009b, 128–34, 430–9; also Seeber 1976, especially 147–54.

²²³ Of course section 25–44, being a pot-pourri almost serving as a string of *voces magicae*, sometimes includes epithets originally belonging to other deities (e.g. line 42 *τερψίμβροτε*, 26 *λοφαίη*, 28 *ποδάρκη*, 33 *μητρίη*), but almost all of them can find an explanation in connection with Hecate-Selene.

²²⁴ Thoth: see lines 25–44, **G** (but the goddess might have obtained these epithets just thanks to her connection with Hermes). Isis: see lines 25–44, **D** (see 10.14–16, *κυρία*, even in this case the identification with Isis is not strictly necessary); line 31, *πελαγίη*; line 37, *σώτειρα*.

CONCLUSIONS

Hecate might be identified with Isis, 'Isis' would be used as another name of the moon goddess and, again, this association would not add any 'foreign' attribute to Hecate. In conclusion, though the hymn employs Egyptian magical procedures, the nature of the deity invoked is still in line with Greek religious thought.

HYMN 12

HYMN TO HECATE-SELENE- PERSEPHONE-ARTEMIS: IV 2522–67 (FOURTH CENTURY)

This hymn appears together with 13 in another ἀγωγή, ‘spell of attraction’ (IV 2441–621), which does not have an exclusively amatory purpose since it can also cause sickness, destroy and be used as a dream oracle.

- Preliminaries: Long list of ingredients for the preparation of a mixture to be used as burnt offering. Whenever the magician wants to perform the rite, he has to make the offering on a charcoal fire and recite the invocation from a lofty roof.
- Invocation: A prose slander conjuration addressed to the lunar goddess who has to torment and attract the specified woman as she is allegedly guilty of having revealed to mankind the mysteries of the goddess.
- Notes: For all the different purposes, there are specific formulae to be added to the basic invocation. As the rite can turn out to be very dangerous, the performer has to add a protective charm, i.e. a magical formula written on a papyrus roll to be worn around his right arm.
- Second invocation (‘attached to the first’): The **hymn** invokes the lunar goddess so that she comes and fulfils what the magician wants.
- Third invocation (to be used only when slander is involved in the goals of the procedure): Slander hymn (see 13A); the conjuration proceeds in prose listing secret names and epithets of the goddess.

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: Pr (also reconstructed hymn 20).²²⁵ Many passages of the hymn are paralleled in 15 (see Conclusions below).

- (θύω σοι) τόδ' ἄλρωμα, Διὸς τέκος, ἰοχέαιρα,
 Ἄρτεμι, | Περσεφόνη, ἐλαφηβόλε, νυκτοφάνεια, |
 τρίκτυπε, τρίφθογγε, τρικάρανε Σελήνη, | (2525)
 θρινακία, τριπρόσωπε, τριαύχενε καὶ τριοδίτι, |
 5 ἢ τρισσοῖς ταλάροισιν ἔχεις φλογὸς ἀκάματον πῦρ |
 καὶ τριόδον μεθέπεις τρισσῶν δεκάδων τε ἀνάσσεις
 καὶ τρισὶ μορφαῖσι | καὶ φλέγμασι καὶ σκυλάκεσσι- (2530)
 διὸ νῦν | ἐξ ἀτόνων πέμπεις ὀξεῖαν ἰωήν,
 φρικτὸν | ἀναυδήσασα θεὰ τρισσοῖς στομάτεσσι. |
 10 κλαγγῆς σῆς ἀκούοντα τὰ κοσμικὰ πάντα | δονεῖται·
 νερτέριαί τε πύλαι καὶ Λήθης | ἱερὸν ὕδωρ (2535)
 καὶ χάος ἀρχαίτατον καὶ Ταρ|τάρου χάσμα φαεινόν.
 ἦν πάντες ἀθά|νατοι, ἦν τε θνητοὶ {τε} ἄνθρωποι,
 οὐρεά | τε ἀστερόεντα, νάπαι καὶ δένδρεα πάντα |
 15 καὶ ποταμοὶ κελαδοῦντες ἰδ' ἀτρύγετός τε | θάλασσα, | (2540)
 ἤχῳ ἐρημαίῃ καὶ δαίμονες οἱ κατὰ κόσμον |
 φρίσσουσί σε, μάκαιρα, ἀκούοντες ὅπα δεινὴν. |
 δεῦρ' ἴθι μοι, νυχία, θηροκτόνε, δεῦρ' ἐπ' ἀγωγῆς, |
 ἥσυχε καὶ δασπλῆτι, σοροῖς ἔνι δαιτὺν ἔχουσα, |
 20 εὐχάισιν ἐπάκουσον ἐμαῖς, πολυώδυνε Σελήνη, | (2545)
 ἢ νυκταιροδύτεια, τρικάρανε, τριώνυμε Μῆνη, |
 μαρζουνη, φοβερὰ καὶ ἄβρονόη καὶ Πειθῷ, |
 δεῦρ' ἴθι μοι, κερατῶπι, φαεσφόρε, ταυρεό|μορφε,
 ἵπποπρόσωπε θεά, κυνολύγματε, | δεῦρο, λύκαινα, (2550)
 25 καὶ μόλε νῦν, νυχία, χθο|νία, ἁγία, μελανείμων,
 ἦν ἀνακυκλεῖται | κόσμου φύσις ἀστερόφοιτος,
 ἥνικ' ἄγαν | αὐξῆς. σὺ τὰ κοσμικὰ πάντα τέθεικας, |
 γεννᾷς γάρ σὺ πάντα ἐπὶ χθονὸς ἥδ' ἀπὸ | πόντου (2555)
 καὶ πτηνῶν δ' ἐξῆς παντοῖα | γένη παλίνεδρα.
 30 πανγεννήτεια | καὶ ἐρωτοτόκεια Ἀφροδίτη,
 λαμπα|δία, φαέθουσα καὶ αὐγάζουσα Σελήνη, |
 ἀστροδία καὶ οὐρανία, δαδοῦχε, πυρίπνου, |

²²⁵ Cf. Fauth 2006, 57–9.

- 35 τετραπροσωπεινή, τετραώνυμε, | τετραοδίτι, (2560)
 χαῖρε, θεά, καί σαῖσιν ἐπω|νυμίαις ἐπάκουσον,
 οὐρανία, λιμενί|τι, ὀρίπλανε εἰνοδία τε,
 νερτερία, | βυθία, αἰωνία σκοτία τε·
 ἐλθ' ἐπ' ἐμαῖς | θυσίαις καί μοι τόδε πρᾶγμα τέλεσσον (2565)
 εὐχομένῳ τε ἐπάκουσον ἐμοί, λίτομαί | σε, ἄνασσα.

3 τριφοντε, P; τρίφθογγε, *PGM* IV 2820 (see 15.24) 4 τριναχία,
 P; θρινακία, *PGM* IV 2822 (see 15.25) 5 φλογας, P 6 τριο-
 δων μεθεπεις τρισσων δεκα|των δε ανασσεις, P 7 τρεις,
 P 8 διο νυν, P; δεινήν, Wessely, Pr; οξεανίων, P 9 φρυκτῶ,
 P 11 νεκταριαιδε, P 12 αρχετατον, P; φαεινων, P 15
 ηδ' ατρυγετοσ, P 19 Radern; δεσποιτισαρωσις επι δετον
 εχουσα, P; δασπλητι, τάφοις ἐνι δαῖταν ἔχουσα, Pr following the
 parallel in *PGM* IV 2856–7 (see commentary and 15.48) 20
 πολυωδυνε, P; πολυώνυμε, Pr 22 απρονη, P 23 δευροθι,
 P 27 ηνικαγαρ, P 28 χθονασ, P 29 δεξιε, P 32
 αστροχια, P; αστροχίτων, Wessely; αστρο[δ]ία, Pr 33 τετρα-
 προσωπεινή, Pr (hymns); τετραπρόσωπε γ(υ)νή, Pr 34 σαισεν,
 P; σαῖσιν, cf. *PGM* IV 2851 (see 15.44) 35 οριαιλαναι, P 36
 πορτερια, ασκοτια, P

Translation

- I offer to you in sacrifice this spice, child of Zeus, shooter of
 arrows,
 Artemis, Persephone, deer-huntress, who shine in the night,
 thrice-resounding, three-voiced, three-headed Selene,
 three-pointed, with three faces and three necks, goddess of the
 crossroads,
 5 you who, in triple baskets, hold the indefatigable fire of the flame
 and attend to the crossroads and rule the triple decades,
 with three forms and flames and dogs;
 for this reason, indeed you send a sharp yell from toneless (throats),
 when you, goddess, raise your voice in a horrid sound with triple
 mouths.
 10 All the things of this world are shaken when they hear your scream:
 Netherworld's doors, and Lethe's sacred water,

COMMENTARY

- and primeval infinite darkness and Tartarus' shining abyss.
At your yell, all the immortals and the mortal men,
the starred mountains, the valleys and all the trees
15 and the resounding rivers and the always rippling sea,
the lonely echo and the daimons through the cosmos,
shiver in fear of you, blessed one, when they hear the dreadful voice.
Come here to me, nocturnal, wild beast slayer, come here at my love
spell of attraction,
quiet and horrible, who have your meal among the coffins,
20 listen to my prayers, you who bring many pains, Selene,
who rise and set at night, three-headed, three-named Mene,
MARZOUNĒ dreadful, who weaken the mind, Peitho,
come here to me, you who appear with horns, light-bringer, bull-
shaped,
goddess with the face of a horse, howling like a dog, come here,
she-wolf,
25 and come here now, nocturnal, chthonic, sacred, dressed in black,
in whom recurs the nature of the cosmos proceeding among the stars
whenever you wax too much. You have arranged all the things in the
world,
for you generate everything on earth and from the sea
and, then, every kind of birds' races which come back to their
homes.
30 You who generate everything and give birth to love, Aphrodite,
torch-bearing, shining and bright Selene,
with starry paths, heavenly, torch-bearer, fire-breathing,
with four faces, four names, goddess of the four roads,
hail, goddess, listen to your epithets,
35 heavenly, goddess of the harbour, mountain-wanderer, guardian of
the roads,
infernal, who are in the depths, immortal, who are in the darkness.
Come to my sacrifices and fulfil this deed for me,
listen to me as I am praying, I beg you, queen.

COMMENTARY

ι (θύω σοι) τὸδ' ἄρωμα: The 'spice' refers to the mixture for the burnt offering described in the prose section.

2–6 Paralleled in 15.23–7.

1–2 Hecate is identified with Artemis and Persephone, both daughters of Zeus, see 10.3–5, 4, 11.25–44, C.

ἐλαφιβόλε: Traditional epithet of the huntress Artemis.²²⁶

νυκτοφάνεια: Late and very rare formation, it expresses the lunar nature of the goddess (cf. 10.3–5 νυχία).

3–7 The passage stresses the triplicity of the goddess (see 10.3–5):²²⁷ from an iconographical point of view in her being three-headed (τρίκτυπε, τρίφθογγε, τρικάρανε,²²⁸ τριπρόσωπε,²²⁹ τριαύχενε²³⁰); in her apotropaic function as goddess of the crossroads (τριοδίτι,²³¹ τρίοδον μεθέπεις²³²); and in her three-phased lunar nature (Σελήνη, τρισσῶν δεκάδων τε ἀνάσσεις, τρισὶ μορφαῖσι καὶ φλέγμασι²³³). Even her dogs are said to be three (see 10.30).

θρινακία: Not attested as a divine epithet, it is possibly used just as a synonym of τρίμορφος (see line 7 and 15.6).

ἡ τρισσοῖς ταλάροισιν ἔχεις φλογὸς ἀκάματον πῦρ: Ἀκάματον πῦρ still refers to the light of the sun (see 2.2, διέπων φλογὸς . . .): the moon reflects it in different ways according to her three different phases. For Hecate with the basket, see 11.90–4.

8–9 The papyrus has ἀτόνων, ‘relaxed’, ‘weak’, or ‘unaccented’: Preisendanz translates ‘aus lautloser Stille’, as the yell developed/sprang from a ‘soundless silence’; Betz chooses ‘toneless throats’. The first option would fit the

²²⁶ E.g. *HH* 27.2 (cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.319); Hes. fr. 23a.21 (Merkelbach and West); Anacr. *PMG* fr. 3.1; Cornut. 71.12; Plu. *De soll.* 966a8; *OH* 36.10.

²²⁷ Lines 2–6 are paralleled in IV 2818–26 (15.23–7). ²²⁸ Also at 21.

²²⁹ Hecate: Artemid. *Onirocr.* 2.37.5; Chariclides, *PCG* fr. 1.2. Artemis-moon: Cleomedes, 2.5.88.

²³⁰ Hecate: Lycophr. 1186 (and *Scholia ad loc.*). ²³¹ See 10.3–5.

²³² The parallel in IV 2825 (15.27), has μεδέεις, ‘protect’, but μεθέπεις equally fits the context.

²³³ The ‘three kinds of heat’ (φλέγμα) are the three phases of the moon with their different degree of light.

context, but requires the meaning of ἄτῶνος to be freely adapted and does not really explain the use of the plural unless we imagine a reference to the ‘soundless abodes of the Underworld’. In the second case it is unclear how these ‘toneless’, or ‘relaxed’, throats can produce such a sharp yell. I wonder if ἀτόνων was a mistake for ἀτόμων, ‘indivisible’, referring to the three bodies of the goddess on which such stress was put in the preceding lines.²³⁴ At the beginning of the verse the papyrus reads διὸ νῦν, ‘consequently’, but Preisendanz, following the suggestion of Wessely, emended it to δεινὴν, ‘a dreadful sharp yell’. However, if we posit a reference to the three bodies of the goddess, there is no need to emend διὸ νῦν. The meaning would be ‘you have three heads, three voices, three forms ... so you send a really sharp yell from your indivisible heads/voices/bodies when you raise your voice with triple mouths’.

In Greek literature, the utterance of shrill terrifying sounds is often attributed to ghosts, Underworld entities and monstrous creatures, and it is described with a lexicon usually referring to the cries of chthonic or nocturnal animals. Similar sounds, such as the squeaking of bats, the hissing of serpents, or the howling of dogs and wolves, can be also reproduced by men in order to communicate with the dead and Underworld deities.²³⁵ Similarly, in Egyptian imagery, since the ability of keeping silence was considered a virtue (sign of self-possession and composure),²³⁶ loud cries can be attributed to demonic entities such as the doorkeepers of the Netherworld who can bear names like ‘Mistress of darkness,

²³⁴ LSJ, ἄτομος II.

²³⁵ Ogden 2001, 227–9; Howe 1954, 212 (attributed to the Gorgoneion); cf. the hexameters from Selinous (see **Intro.** pp. 34–5), Jordan and Kotansky 2011 and Faraone and Obbink 2013, Col. i, 13–14, where Hecate Enodia ‘shouting a foreign-sounding shout in a terrifying voice (φρικώδει φωνῇ βάρβαρον ἐκκλάζουσα), does, herself a goddess, point out to a god the way’.

²³⁶ Assmann, *LdÄ* ‘Reden und Schweigen’.

loud of shouting', 'she of loud voice, the one whose cries awake'.²³⁷

10–17 The passage exhibits the same *topos* of the cosmos shivering in fear/awe of the god discussed in the hymns to the male deity (see 1.10. 3.1–8, 29–31, 9.7–10). The only difference is that the participation of the Underworld is much more stressed, and that the cosmos trembles at the sharp yell of the goddess.

νερτέριαί τε πύλαι: See 3.27–8, I n.293.

χάος ἀρχαίτατον: Though the adjective 'primeval' attributed to chaos probably derives from the Hesiodic conception in which it was described as the first principle/god coming into being before the creation of the universe (Chaos), here 'chaos' seems to refer to 'infinite darkness' conceived as an 'area', or feature, of the Underworld as it does in other *PGM* passages (see 1.20–1, and I n.121).

οὐρεά τε ἀστερόεντα: The Homeric 'starry sky', οὐρανὸς ἀστερόεις, has been replaced by the alliterating οὐρεα.

ἀτρύγετος: Used to describe the sea in Homer and Hesiod.²³⁸

ἦχὼ ἐρημαίη: Whether ἦχώ has to be understood as the acoustic phenomenon or as its personification, i.e. the nymph Echo, the sense does not change. Possibly, shivering in fear of the deity always implied the idea of keeping reverential silence (see 3.1–8): even the echo, normally unavoidable, stops in front of the goddess. At the same time, since here the triggering event is the yell sent by the triple Hecate, the echo trembles in fear of repeating the dreadful sound.

μάκαιρα: See 1.20.

18 δεῦρ' ἴθι μοι: Also at 23, see 4.1, 6.2–3.²³⁹

²³⁷ *BoD* 146. Cf. Frandsen 1998.

²³⁸ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.327, 14.204 (ἀτρυγέτοιο θαλάσσης), *Od.* 1.72, 8.49; *HH* 22.2; Hes. *Th.* 413, 728.

²³⁹ For δεῦρ' ἴθι see e.g. Hom. *Il.* 3.130; Aristoph. *Nu.* 932, *Lys.* 1271.

νυχία: Also at 25, see 10.3–5.

θηροκτόνε: Epithet of Artemis,²⁴⁰ variant of *θηροφόνος*,²⁴¹ attributed to Hecate because of her identification with the huntress goddess (see 10.3–5).

19 The line has been emended in two ways (see apparatus) based on IV 2856 (15.48) but the papyrus has *δεσποιτισαρωσις επι δετον εχουσα*, which hardly fits the alleged parallel. On the other hand, *δεσπότι*, ‘mistress’, and *σάρωσις*, ‘sweeping, rubbish’, might be recognized, or a reading *δέσποινα*, *άώροις ενι δαιτυν εχουσα*, ‘mistress, who have your meal among those who died untimely’, can be suggested: it would be a little odd considering the previous adjective *ἥσυχε* followed by *καί*, but closer to the papyrus reading. The only certain reading is *ἥσυχε*, which could refer either to Hecate’s ‘positive’ aspect of torch-bearer maiden in contrast with her negative one of ruler of the Underworld (cf. 15.48),²⁴² or it could be an antiphrastical epithet underlining her aggressive nature.²⁴³

20 πολυώδυne: The *Homeric Hymns* use the synonym *πολυπήμων*, ‘causing manifold woe’, twice to qualify witchcraft.²⁴⁴ Whether it influenced the choice of our epithet or not, *πολυώδυνος* suits the Underworld negative features of Hecate.

21 Another line stressing Hecate’s lunar nature: see 10.3 *τρικάρανε*, 11.22–4.

22 μαρζουνη: Though it seems unlikely (J. F. Quack), it has been suggested that it derives from the Egyptian *mršt iwent*, ‘the bright red one of Dendera’, referring to Hathor.²⁴⁵

άβρονή: Although this *hapax* is usually translated as ‘gracious/gentle-minded’ (from the adjective *άβρός*, ‘delicate,

²⁴⁰ Eur. *IA* 1570; Aristoph. *Lys.* 1262; Cornut. 71.12; *OH* 36.9; Porph. *De abst.* 1.22.3; Hesych. *Θ* 538.

²⁴¹ E.g. Theogn. *Eleg.* 1.11; Eur. *HF* 378; Aristoph. *Th.* 320.

²⁴² Theocr. 2.11 where Selene is called *ἥσυχος* in contrast with Hecate, see especially *Scholia in Theocr.* 2.11/12a.

²⁴³ Cf. *Etymol. Gud. Add.* E 557: *Εύκολίνη*.

²⁴⁴ *HH* 2.230, 4.37 (Richardson 2010, *ad loc.*).

²⁴⁵ BG.

languid'), it might have the causative shade 'who weakens the mind' (cf. the verb ἄβρύνω, 'to make delicate, languid') – like other late compounds such as θελξίνοος, 'charming the heart', or ἀεξίνοος, 'strengthening the mind' – which better suits the nature of the goddess and the proximity of Peitho.

Πειθώ: Peitho was the personification of persuasion, embodying the ability to convince someone to do something he/she did not want to do. She often operated in amatory contexts and was closely associated with Aphrodite.²⁴⁶ As our incantation can also be used as a love spell, the identification Hecate-Peitho seems to underline the ability of the goddess in this field. Remarkably, Peitho was sometimes thought to be the mother of the nymph Iynx²⁴⁷ (see 11.52, II n.177) and serves as an epithet of Nature in *OH* 10.13 (see 12.27–30). At the same time, the appearance of Hecate-Peitho anticipates the identification of the goddess with Aphrodite at line 30.

23 κερατῶπι, ταυρεόμορφε:²⁴⁸ In earlier Greek literature there is a visual association between the bull and the moon, since, especially in astronomical/logical texts, the moon could be described as 'horned' owing to the shape of the crescent, and κεραία could be used for its 'horns'.²⁴⁹ In Nonnus, Selene is often described as bull-shaped, driving a team of bulls, or riding a bull.²⁵⁰ Thus, one of the reasons why Hecate obtained epithets of this kind was her lunar nature, as confirmed by Dorotheus of Sidon, who lists both 'Hecate' and 'horned'

²⁴⁶ E.g. Ibyc. *PMG* fr. 7; Pind. *Pyth.* 4.216–19, 9.39; Aesch. *Supp.* 1038–42; Soph. *Tr.* 660–2; *Anacreontea* 16.24–5; Paus. 1.22.3.1–3, 5.11.8.7–8; *OH* 55.9 (where the two are identified). Käppel, *NP* 'Peitho'.

²⁴⁷ Phot. *M* 458, I 273; Suda, I 759, 761.7–8. On the connection between the *inyx* wheel and Peitho, Johnston 1995a, especially 186–91.

²⁴⁸ Cf. IV 2809–10, 2832 (15.16–17, 32).

²⁴⁹ E.g. Arat. *Phaen.* 1.733, 778–80; Melampus, *Lunarium CCAG* 4.111.11, 4.112.1; Dorotheus Sidonius, 328.6.

²⁵⁰ E.g. Nonn. *Dion.* 1.97–8 (Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad loc.*), 216–17, 2.405–6, 5.72, 7.247, 11.186 (Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad loc.*), 17.236–40, 36.346–7. Selene is 'bull-horned' also in *OH* 9.2, and in 29.11 Persephone is κερόεσσα, 'horned'.

among the epithets of the moon.²⁵¹ The connection between Hecate and the bull was probably also promoted by the existence of an Artemis Tauropolos: whether the epithet originally meant ‘worshipped at Tauris’, ‘tamer of bulls’ or ‘drawn by a yoke of bulls’, it ended up creating a connection between Artemis and the bull (on Hecate-Artemis see **10.3–5**).²⁵²

At the same time, in the Egyptian tradition, Hathor, the cow goddess of the sky, was often represented with a horned bovine head later found also in Isiac iconography thanks to the assimilation Isis-Hathor attested from the New Kingdom onwards. Therefore, the bovine features of Hecate could have been stressed because of her identification with Isis-Hathor (see **Intro.** pp. 9–10).²⁵³ Hathor shared with Hecate a liminal and funerary function as guide of the dead in the Underworld, but she was also a goddess of love identified with Aphrodite:²⁵⁴ the erotic purpose of most *PGM* spells involving Hecate could have fostered the assimilation between the two goddesses. On the other hand, the ‘many-named’ Isis also absorbed Hecate in her field of action (see **Intro.** pp. 9–10)²⁵⁵ and, though Isis was not a lunar goddess in Pharaonic Egypt, she assumed this nature during the Hellenistic period thanks to an *interpretatio graeca* of her functions and attributes. Among the latter, her (originally Hathorian) horned crown was reinterpreted as a symbol of the moon crescent.²⁵⁶

φωσφόρε: Not only can this adjective and its variant φωσφόρος be used to describe bright astral bodies such as the planet Venus or the moon, but φωσφόρος is also a

²⁵¹ Dorotheus Sidonius, 3a.14. For Hecate bull-headed see **10.3–5** τρικάρ-ανε, **II** n.33; with a crescent on her head, Laumonier 1958, 408.

²⁵² Cf. Suda, T 164–5. Hecate is ταυροπόλος in *OH* 1.7.

²⁵³ Daumas, *LdA* ‘Hathor’; Dunand 1973b, 12–15. Cf. also the magical amulets showing a goddess with bovine head and torches in both hands, DD 155–6, nos. 203–5.

²⁵⁴ Bleeker 1973, especially 39–45.

²⁵⁵ Cf. *IG* XII.1.742 dedication to Hecate and Sarapis.

²⁵⁶ Delia 1998; cf. **Intro.** n.28. Cf. Fauth 2006, 67–76.

traditional epithet of Hecate in her positive role of torch-bearer maiden, assimilated with Artemis and Persephone (see 10.3–5).²⁵⁷

24 ἱποπρόσωπε: See 11.58, 10.3–5 τρικάρανε and II n.33.

κυνολύγματε: See 10.30.

λύκαινα: See 11.25–44, E, λυκώ.

25 χθονία: Typical epithet of Hecate as Underworld goddess.²⁵⁸

ἁγία: See 9.11, cf. 4.1, 3.

μελανείμων: Probably this epithet is used metaphorically to describe the goddess as nocturnal and chthonian.²⁵⁹ If a specific reference has to be found, we may think of the Erinyes, often described as wearing black robes,²⁶⁰ or of Demeter Melaina, worshipped at Phigalia (see 11.58). At the same time, Isis and her priests wore black robes, which, according to Plutarch, may originate from the mourning of the goddess for the death of Osiris, or from her lunar nature.²⁶¹

26–7 The cyclicity of the lunar phases becomes the symbol of a periodic regeneration of the cosmos.

27–30 Considering that epithets or descriptions of Hecate as creator deity are very rare in the hymns addressed to this goddess – the only other instance is IV 2831–9 (15.31–6) – it

²⁵⁷ E.g. Eur. *Hel.* 569, fr. 42c* (Snell); Aristoph. *Th.* 858, *PCG* fr. 608; *Scholia in Aristoph. Lys.* 443; *Scholia in Theocr.* 11/12c; Hippol. *Refut.* 4.35.5.2. Also of Artemis as moon goddess: e.g. Eur. *IT* 21; (Diotimus) *AP* 6.267.1; Callim. *Hym.* 3.204 (Bornmann 1968, *ad loc.*); Cornut. 71.6. For Selene: *OH* 9.1. On Hecate torch-bearer in iconography see Farnell 1896, II.550; Sarian, *LLMC*, 'Hekate', I.A; Laumonier 1958, 407–8, 412–13, 554; Kraus 1960, 92–4, 100–1.

²⁵⁸ E.g. Aristoph. *PCG* fr. 515; Theocr. 2.12; Plu. *De superst.* 166a5, *Aet. Rom.* 290d3; Artemid. *Oniocr.* 2.34.23, 2.39.36; *OH* 1.1; *Scholia in Eur. Tr.* 323; Hippol. *Refut.* 4.35.5.1.

²⁵⁹ Cf. Eur. *Ion* 1150; Alexis, *PCG* fr. 93.

²⁶⁰ See 11.58, II n.185; cf. Hades μελανείμων, in Phlegon, *De Mirab.* 3.11.16.

²⁶¹ E.g. Isidorus, *Hym.* 3.34, Isis μελανηφόρος (Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.*; Bernand 1969, 631, no. 175, *ad loc.*; Bricault 1996, 51; *OH* 42.9; Plu. *De Iside* 352b4–9, 356d9–11, 372d5–10; SIG 977a.2, 1134.

seems they originally belonged to invocations to different deities such as Isis or, in this case, Aphrodite. Had the creative process been an established and distinctive function of Hecate in the *PGM*, we would expect it to be mentioned more frequently, especially in long series of epithets, as happened in the hymns to the male deity, but the passages dealing with it are somehow freestanding and easily detachable from the rest.

The *Homeric Hymn* to Aphrodite opens with the goddess inspiring love in all men, birds that fly in the air, and all creatures that the earth and the sea rear.²⁶² Similarly, Euripides says that Aphrodite φοιτᾷ δ' ἄν' αἰθέρ', ἔστι δ' ἐν θαλασσίῳ κλύδωνι Κύπρις, πάντα δ' ἐκ ταύτης ἔφω, 'moves through the air, she dwells in the sea-wave, and everything generates from her'.²⁶³ The *OH* describe Aphrodite as governing the three regions of the cosmos; she generates everything (γεννᾷς δὲ τὰ πάντα) that is in the sky, in the earth and in the abyss of the sea, and she is the mother of Loves.²⁶⁴ The underlying idea is that 'love' is the driving force behind generation, thus a creative principle. As Greeks strongly associated human reproduction with the earth's fertility, Aphrodite was often connected with goddesses such as Gaea and Nature,²⁶⁵ to whom similar invocations are addressed. The *Homeric Hymn* to Gaea tells us that she is παμμήτειρα, 'the mother of all', and that she feeds all creatures, the ones upon the earth and all that are in the seas and that fly. In the *OH*, Nature is called παμμήτειρα θεά and πανδώτειρα, 'giver of all', and she protects the air, the earth and the sea; Gaea, likewise πανδώτειρα, is the mother of the blessed ones and mortals.²⁶⁶ Not by chance does the hymn to

²⁶² *HH* 5.1–6 (Richardson 2010, *ad loc.*); cf. 3.5–6.

²⁶³ Eur. *Hipp.* 447–8.

²⁶⁴ *OH* 55.5–8 (Ricciardelli 2000, *ad loc.*); Aphrodite mother of Loves/Love e.g. Pind. fr. 122*.4–6 (Maehler); Plato, *Phdr.* 242d8; Paus. 9.27.2.1–3; Nonn. *Dion.* 33.42.

²⁶⁵ Pirenne-Delforge, *NP* 'Aphrodite' B.1.

²⁶⁶ *OH* 10.1, 14, 16, 18, 26.1–2. On the identification of Gaea-Demeter-Rhea and the Phrygian Mother Goddess in *OH* see Rudhardt 2008, 294–6.

Aphrodite which appears in the same *PGM* IV describe the goddess as θεῶν γενέτειρα καὶ ἀνδρῶν . . . Φύσι παμμήτωρ, ‘mother of gods and men . . . Nature mother of all’,²⁶⁷ and the same epithets appear in the hymn to Hecate 15.32–3, the only other instance in which the goddess has a creative function.

At first Aphrodite and Gaea/Nature hardly seem to find a connection with the terrifying Hecate-Selene of the *PGM*. However, the traditional Hecate exerted her power over the three regions of the cosmos, exactly like these goddesses, and was closely connected with Demeter/Core, i.e. with the chthonic deities presiding over the produce of the earth. Thanks to her assimilation with the Anatolian Mother Goddess it seems she was connected with Aphrodite at Samothrace, where they both appear in a chthonic cult identified with Zerynthia, a Thracian Mother Goddess to whom dogs were sacrificed.²⁶⁸ Furthermore, Hecate’s identification with Aphrodite-Gaea-Nature could have been fostered by her assimilation with Isis and Isis-Hathor (see **Intro.** pp. 9–10, and here line 23).²⁶⁹

31 λαμπαδία: Usually not employed as a divine epithet, the term is a variation of φωσφόρος (see line 23), describing Hecate in her traditional role of torch-bearer.

φαέθουσα καὶ ἀνγάζουσα Σελήνη: Possibly echoing Φαέθουσά τε Λαμπετίη, the two Homeric nymphs, daughters of the sun, who pastured the herds of Helios.²⁷⁰

²⁶⁷ Cf. also παγγενέτειρα used for Gaea in *Orac. Sib.* 3.675, 714, 744; for Nature in *AP* 12.97.4.

²⁶⁸ Kraus 1960, 66–9, 76–7; von Bredow, *NP* ‘Zerynthus’. On the identification of the Anatolian Mother Goddess with Rhea and Demeter see Roller 1999, 169–77.

²⁶⁹ Cf. Apul. *Metam.* 11.25 (287.1–5): Isis, ‘Awe of her majesty imbues the birds that move in the sky, the wild beasts that roam the mountains, the serpents that glide in the earth, and the monsters that swim in the sea’, see Griffiths 1975, 323–5, underlining the Egyptian precedents; Isis-Aphrodite, Leclant 1986, 343.

²⁷⁰ Hom. *Od.* 12.132.

32 ἀστροδία καὶ οὐρανία: When the *OH* describe Hecate as οὐρανίαν χθονίαν τε καὶ εἰναλίαν, ‘heavenly, chthonic and marine’,²⁷¹ they seem to allude to the Hesiodic goddess (see 10.3–5), but here οὐρανία (also at line 35), together with ἀστροδία, is used to reassert that Hecate is the moon.²⁷²

δαδοῦχε: Another variant for Hecate torch-bearer (see line 23, φαεσφόρε, and 10.3–5).²⁷³

πυρίπνου: Considering the preceding epithets, ‘fire-breathing’ is probably a metaphor for the light emanating from the moon, exactly as in *PGMI* 34 it is used for the sun god in a passage of Egyptian origin no doubt alluding to the fire-spitting uraeus (cf. 1.33, 5.1, δράκων . . .).²⁷⁴ We could hypothesize that Hecate is here identified with the fierce lion goddess Sekhmet, but this is not strictly necessary. Considering that at IV 2727–8 (14.10) ‘the ghosts of Hecate’ are called ‘fire-breathing’, the choice of this term as an epithet of the goddess could have equally been influenced by the image of Greek monstrous fire-breathing creatures, especially the three-headed πυρίπνοος Chimera.²⁷⁵

33 Cf. 15.22. When John Lydus²⁷⁶ in the sixth century tells us that Hecate can be ‘four-headed’ because of the power the moon exerts over the four elements, we are clearly dealing with a later ‘philosophical’ explanation. Pausanias records the presence of a statue of a four-headed Hermes in a crossroad of the Potters’ quarter at Athens bearing the inscription Ἑρμῇ τετρακέφαλε . . . πάνθ’ ὁράας, ‘four-headed Hermes . . . you

²⁷¹ *OH* 1.2; cf. 55.1 Aphrodite οὐρανία.

²⁷² Cf. Hecate ‘infernal, chthonic and heavenly’ in Hippol. *Refut.* 4.35.5.1; or Hecate οὐρανόφοιτος, ‘walking in the sky’, in Porph. *De philo.* 151.3.

²⁷³ See Bacchyl. *Hym.* fr. 2.1 (Irigoín), cf. *Scholia in Apoll. Rhod.* 233.10; *Scholia in Soph. Tr.* 214; *Scholia in Aristoph. Lys.* 443. Also e.g. in *OH* 9.3 (Selene), 36.3 (Artemis).

²⁷⁴ Cf. IV 592.

²⁷⁵ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 6.182; Hes. *Th.* 319; Pind. *Ol.* 13.90 (and *Scholia* 128a); Ps.-Apollod. 1.85.4; 2.31.5–8. A different philosophical echo in *OH* 5.3, 10.26 where the epithet is used for Ether and Nature.

²⁷⁶ J. Lydus, *De mens.* 3.8.8–21.

see all', clearly referring to the apotropaic protection of the *limen* that the god shared with Hecate, but this time probably in connection with the four cardinal points.²⁷⁷ The appearance of τετραοδίτι (see 10.3–5, II n.21) in our sequence seems to point in the same direction: the number four could simply be a variant of three.

However, Hecate is also called τετραώνυμε, and we saw that when she is 'three-named' the epithet refers to Artemis, Selene and Hecate as the three moon phases (see 10.3–5, τρικάρανε). In the second century, Cleomedes tells us that 'formerly physicists and astrologists said there were three moon phases: the crescent, the half-moon and the full moon; therefore it is customary to represent Artemis three-faced. But more recently they added to the three the one that is now called convex (gibbous).'²⁷⁸ This fourth phase of the moon seems to be the main reason for the use of the epithets τετραπρόσωπος and τετραώνυμος. Moreover, since Aphrodite (line 30) makes here her only appearance in the hymns to Hecate, she could have been added to Artemis-Selene-Hecate as the fourth deity representing the fourth lunar phase. The creation of these variants of the 'three-pattern' could have also been promoted by the appearance of a four-faced Hathor (see line 23) both in the texts and decorations of Ptolemaic temples. Derchain²⁷⁹ demonstrated that this form of Hathor is strictly connected with the four cardinal points – for the Egyptians, symbolic of all the cosmos (see 2.6) – and expresses the universal power of the goddess.

34 χαίρε: See 5.1.

35 λιμενίτι: The synonym λιμενοσκόπος is an epithet of Artemis of Phrae²⁸⁰ in Thessaly, where the goddess was

²⁷⁷ Cf. the Hermes' epithet τετραγώνος (*Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων* E 71) referring to the four-sided shaft of the hermai.

²⁷⁸ Cleomedes, 2.5.87–91.

²⁷⁹ Derchain 1972.

²⁸⁰ Callim. *Hym.* 3.259, also 39 (Bornmann 1968, *ad loc.*), Artemis λιμένεσσιν ἐπίσκοπος (for her temple near the harbour at Munychia, Paus. 2.30.7); *Scholia in Lycophr.* 1180.

identified with Hecate. Apollonides of Smyrna makes a fisherman offer a red mullet to Artemis *λιμενῖτις*.²⁸¹ it could be a coincidence, given the profession of the man, but the red mullet was traditionally offered to Hecate-moon, both because she was also a marine deity and because the name of the fish, *τρίγλη*, recalled the triplicity of the goddess.²⁸² Therefore, the use of this epithet for Artemis may be due to her identification with Hecate, traditionally associated both with the sea and with the protection of liminal places (among which the harbour could have been included thanks to its 'boundary' function, see 10.3–5).

ὄριπλανε: Another epithet that Hecate obtained through her identification with Artemis; cf. *OH* 1.8, where Hecate is *οὐρεσιφοῖτις*, 'mountain-roaming'. Even if *ὄριπλανος* is not attested with Artemis but only with Dionysus – another mountain-dweller –²⁸³ as huntress she is the goddess of mountains *par excellence* and is often described as hunting in, running through and inhabiting the mountains.²⁸⁴

εἰνοδία: See 10.30.

36 A series of epithets referring to Hecate as Underworld goddess. *Νερτερία* appears in the hymn to Hecate quoted by Hippolytus,²⁸⁵ while *σκοτία* is attested as an epithet of Aphrodite in Egypt and Crete.²⁸⁶ Here they seem to be used quite generically to describe the gloomy nature of the deity. Even *αἰωνία* does not appear to have any special connotation²⁸⁷ but to be used as an equivalent of 'immortal'.

²⁸¹ *AP* 6.105.1–2.

²⁸² E.g. Melanth. *FGrH* fr. 2; Apollod. Athen. *FGrH* fr. 109a; Plu. *De prov.* 8; Athenaeus, 7.126.5–7, 27–32 (Hecate would have had the epithet *τρίγληνος*, 'three-eyed').

²⁸³ Nonn. *Dion.* 45.230 (Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad loc.*).

²⁸⁴ E.g. Hom. *Od.* 6.102; *HH* 27.4; Aristoph. *Th.* 115; Callim. *Hym.* 3.3, 20 (Bornmann 1968, *ad loc.*); *OH* 36.10. The Anatolian Kybele was a goddess of mountains too: Roller 1999, 113, 125, 144.

²⁸⁵ Hippol. *Refut.* 4.35.5.1.

²⁸⁶ Hesych. Σ 1124; *Etymol. Gud.* K 352.3–4. Cf. Diod. Sic. 1.96.9.3; Hecate would have had a temple called *Σκοτίας* near the entrance of Hades.

²⁸⁷ Cf. 1.15.

38 λίτομαί σε: See 2.10.

ἄνασσα: See 11.25-44. J.

CONCLUSIONS

This hymn's structure is slightly closer to the traditional Greek one. After the *epiclēsis* (lines 1-7) we find a section that can be defined as a *eulogia* since it describes some circumstantial actions of the goddess and the results of these actions (lines 8-17). The second half of the hymn is less consistent: a sort of *euchē* with interpolated strings of epithets (lines 18-25); another narrative section (lines 26-30); a list of epithets (lines 31-6); a concluding *euchē* (lines 37-8). This time the references to the magical ritual are much scander (lines 1, 18, 37) but still enough to ascribe the hymn to a magical milieu. The re-elaboration of the motif of the 'god inspiring fear in the cosmos', as well as the parallels 1=15.45, 2-6=15.23-7, 19=15.48, 33=15.22, 35-6=15.46-7, suggests that the hymn was composed by assembling different sources.

As far as the nature of the goddess is concerned, the situation is the same as in 10 and 11 with only one difference: the epithets at line 23 (Hecate bull-shaped) and 33 ('four-shaped') and the passage at lines 27-30 seem to stress the identification of Hecate with Hathor-Isis and Aphrodite-Gaea-Nature. While the association Hecate-Gaea-Nature was possible through the connection Hecate-Demeter (see 10.3-5), the association Hecate-Aphrodite was more difficult and better conceivable through the mediation of Hathor-Isis. However, it has to be noted that passages describing the goddess as 'bull-shaped', 'four-shaped' and 'mother of all' at the same time are found only here and in 15. As none of these attributes appears in other hymns, it would seem they are interrelated: the generative aspect would be the 'fourth' added aspect of the goddess connected with her bull appearance. Therefore, the bull cannot be just a lunar symbol; otherwise it would have been

CONCLUSIONS

inherent to the conventional three-sided nature of the deity. The animal could be used to represent Aphrodite, mentioned by the hymn as the ‘mother of all’, since the bull as a symbol of fertility and untamed sexuality was associated with Aphrodite, goddess of love/sex as driving force behind generation.²⁸⁸ This association was maintained in astrology where Aphrodite/Venus was the tutelary goddess/planet of the zodiacal sign Taurus²⁸⁹ and this astral Aphrodite-bull connection might have fostered the choice of this goddess-animal as representative of the fourth phase of Hecate-moon already associated with the bull as simple lunar symbol (see 12.23).

Certainly, the bull’s symbolism could be linked to the cow goddess of love Hathor(-Isis) with whom Hecate may be identified (see line 23), but it could also have been added to the ‘many-shaped’ lunar Hecate to embody her fourth generative aspect as Aphrodite. In fact, all the passages in question (lines 23, 33, 27–30) can be explained by referring to Greek tradition too, and do not convey any theological conception alien to Greek religious imagery (cf. 15, Conclusions).

²⁸⁸ Friedrich 1978, 23, 93–5; Pirenne Delforge 1994, 419–30, cf. 430–46, 384; cf. the connection between Aphrodite and Cyprus and the importance of bull cults on the island (Loulloupis 1979; cf. Budin 2003, 179, 266–8), or the motif of uncontrollable passion embodied by e.g. Pasiphae hiding in an artificial cow in order to copulate with a bull sent – according to some versions of the myth – by Aphrodite (Waldner, *NP* ‘Pasiphae’; cf. Paschalis 1994, 105–15). The bull as a symbol of fertility was also closely connected with the Mother Goddesses of ancient Anatolia and Crete: Dietrich 1967, especially 395–7, 403–10. Cf. also the taurobolium in connection with the Magna Mater Cybele in the Roman period: Borgeaud 1996, 156–68.

²⁸⁹ E.g. Porph. *De antro* 21–22.6; Bouche-Leclercq 1979, 182–92; Barton 1994, 96, 112, 198–9.

HYMN 13

HECATE-SELENE'S διαβολή: IV 2574–610 [A] AND IV 2643–74 [B] (FOURTH CENTURY)

This sinister slander invocation, διαβολή, is attested in two consecutive spells. The metrical sections clearly represent two versions of the same hymn but, since the variants are substantial, their text is presented separately.²⁹⁰ The first version [A] immediately follows 12, being the ‘third invocation’ in the same ἀγωγή (above), while the second version [B] appears in a ‘slander spell to Selene’ (IV 2622–707) whose structure is the following:

- Purposes: The spell attracts, sends dreams, causes sickness, produces dream visions and destroys enemies.
- Protective charm and rite: The magician has to engrave an image of Hecate and *vores magicae* on a lodestone to be worn for protection. Whenever he wants to perform the spell, he should make a burnt offering and recite the invocation.
- Invocation: The slander **hymn** invokes the lunar goddess so that she may punish the victim of the spell who is allegedly guilty of having made illicit offerings to the goddess and of having defamed her.
- Further instructions: Pounding together different ingredients, the magician shapes little pills to be used either as beneficial or compulsive offerings (for the latter an image of Hecate has to be stamped on the pills). A magical formula written on a piece of wood and magical characters inscribed on a silver leaf provide further protection.

²⁹⁰ Cf. LiDonnici 2003, 173–4.

Iambic tetrameters catalectic. Guide edition: Pr (also reconstructed hymn 19).²⁹¹

Version A: IV 2574–610

- ἡ δεῖνά σοι θύει, | θεά, δεινόν τι θυμίασμα, (2575)
 αἰγός τε | ποικίλης στέαρ καὶ αἶμα καὶ μύσαγμα, |
 ἰχῶρα παρθένου νεκρᾶς καὶ καρδίαν | ἀώρου
 καὶ οὐσίαν νεκροῦ κυνὸς | καὶ ἔμβρυον γυναικὸς
 5 καὶ λεπτὰ πίττυρα τῶν πυρῶν καὶ λύματα ὀξύρουντα, (2580)
 ἄλλα, στέαρ ἐλάφου νεκρᾶς | σχῖνόν <τε> μυρσίνην τε,
 δάφνην ἄτελφρον, ἄλφιτα καὶ καρκίνιοιο χηλάς, |
 σφάγγον, ῥόδα, πυρῆνά τε καὶ κρόμ|μυον τὸ μόνον, (2585)
 σκόρδον τε, σύκων | ἄλφιτον, κόπρον κυνοκεφάλαιο |
 10 ὦν τε ἴβεως νεᾶς – ἃ μὴ θέμις – τοῖς | σοῖς ἔθηκε βωμοῖς,
 φύλλα τε τὰμαρίαντιν' εἰς φλόγας πυρὸς βαλοῦσα |
 ἰέρακα τὸν πελαγοδρόμον καὶ γῦπά σοι | σφαγιάζει | (2590)
 καὶ μύγαλον, τὸ{ν} σόν, θεά, μυστήριον μέγιστον. |
 ἔλεξε δ' ἄλγη ταῦτά σε δεδρακέναι ἀπηνῶς. |
 15 κτανεῖν γὰρ ἄνθρωπόν σε ἔφη, πιεῖν τὸ δ' | αἶμα τούτου, (2595)
 σάρκας φαγεῖν, μίτρην τε σὴν | εἶναι τὰ ἔντερα αὐτοῦ
 καὶ δέρμα ἔχειν δορῆς | ἅπαν κεῖς τὴν φύσιν σου θεῖναι,
 <πεῖν> αἶμα ἰέρακος | πελαγίου, τροφήν τε κάνθαρόν σοι.
 ὁ Πάν | δὲ σῶν κατ' ὁμμάτων γονὴν ἀθέμιτον ὥρσε· |
 20 ἐκγίνεται κυνοκέφαλος, ὅταν αἰ μηνιαῖα | καθάρσεις· (2600)
 σὺ δ', ἀκτιῶφι, κοίρανε, μόνη | τύραννε, κραιπνὴ
 Τύχη θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων νεβουτοσουαληθ·
 ἰωῖ λοιμου λαλον, | Συριστί, ηταρονκον βυθουπνουσαν
 κα|θινβεραο (2605)
 εστοχεθ ορενθα αμελχεριβιουθ σφνουθι,
 25 στίξον πικραῖς τιμωρίαις | τὴν δε(ῖνα) τὴν ἄθεςμον,
 ἦν ἅλιν ἐγὼ σοι κατὰ|τροπον ἐναντίως ἐλέ(γ)ξω.
 καλῶ σε, τριπρὸ|σωπον θεάν, Μήνην, ἐράσμιον φῶς,
 Ἑρμῆν | τε καὶ Ἑκάτην ὁμοῦ, ἀρσενόθηλυν ἔρνο{υ}ς· | (2610)
- 1 δινα, P 2 μυσασμα, P; δυσασμα, B 3 ειχωρα, P 5
 μυρων, P; οξυροεντα, P; οξυόεντα, Pr; οξυροῦντα, Wessely 6

²⁹¹ Cf. Fauth 2006, 59–61.

στεθρ, μυρσινησ, P 7 δαφνησ, P 11 Deubn. in Pr apparatus; φυλλατε τοισαραντινοισ, P; ξύλοις τε τοῖς ἀρκευθίνοις, Pr (following the parallel in B) 17 κῖς, P; κείς, Pr; θείναι, corr. B, εστι, P 18 δε κανθαροσ, P 20 εκεινητε, P, but εκγινητε also possible; γινηται, B 25 στεξον, P; πικραισι μυριαισ, P; corr. B 26 ηπεπαεγω, corr. B; ελεξα, B; ἐλέ[γ]ξω, Pr

Translation

Version A: IV 2574–610

- She, NN, is offering in sacrifice to you, goddess, some fatal incense,
and fat of a dappled goat, and blood and impurity,
the liquid humour of a dead maiden and the heart of one who died violently,
and substance of a dead dog, and woman's embryo,
5 and ground wheat's bran and sour dirty water,
salt, fat of a dead hind, lentisk and myrtle,
dark(?) laurel, barley flour and crab claws,
sage, roses, a pip and a single onion,
garlic, fig flour, baboon's dung,
10 an egg of a young ibis – and this is illicit! – she put them on
your altars
throwing into the fire's flames leaves of non-withering plants,
she sacrifices for you a sea-going falcon, a vulture
and a shrewmouse, your greatest mystery, O goddess.
She said that you have done these painful deeds cruelly:
15 for she said that you killed a man and drank his blood,
ate the flesh, that his bowels are your headband,
that you kept all the covering of his skin and put it in your vagina,
that you drank sea-falcon's blood, and had a scarab as your food.
And Pan shot forth his illicit seed against your very eyes
20 a baboon is born whenever there are monthly menstruations;
But you, ΑΚΤΙΩΡΗ, mistress, only absolute ruler, swift,
Fate of gods and daimons NEBOUTOSOUALĒTH
IŌI LOIMOU LALON in Syriac ĒTARONKON BYTHOU PNOUSAN
KATHINBERAO
ESTOCHETH ORENTA AMELCHERIBIOUTH SPHNOUTH,

- 25 brand with harsh punishments, her, NN, the impious one,
whom I will accuse again as she turned herself against you.
I call you, goddess with three faces, Mene, pleasing light,
Hermes and Hecate at the same time, male and female scion.

Version B: IV 2643–74

- ἡ δεινὰ σοι ἐπιθύει, θεά, ἐχθρόν τι θυ|μίασμα,
αἰγὸς στέαρ τῆς ποικίλης καὶ αἶμα | καὶ μύσαγμα, (2645)
κύνειον ἔμβρυον καὶ ἰχώρα | παρθένου ἄωρου
καὶ καρδίαν παιδὸς νέου | σὺν ἀλφίτοις μετ' ὄξους,
- 5 ἄλας τε καὶ ἐλάφου κέ|βρας, σχῖνόν τε μυρσίνην τε
δάφνην | ἄτεφρον, εὐχερῶς, καὶ καρκίνιοι χηλάς, |
σφάγγον, ῥόδον, πυρηνά σοι καὶ κρόμμυον | τὸ μούνον, (2650)
σκόρδον τε μυγάλο κόπρον, κυ|νοκεφάλ(ε)ιον αἶμα,
10 ὦόν τε ἴβευς νεᾶς | – ὃ μὴ θέμις γενέσθαι – ἐν σοὶς ἔθηκε
{καὶ} βω|μίους
ξύλοις ἀρκευθίνουσιν. {ἐλεξεν} ἡ δεινὰ | σε δεδρακέναι τὸ (2655)
πράγμα τοῦτ' ἔλεξεν· |
- 12
13
14
15 κτανεῖν γὰρ ἄνθρωπόν σε ἔφη, π{ε}ιεῖν δὲ | αἶμα τούτου,
σάρκας φαγεῖν, μήτηρ δὲ | σὴν λέγει τὰ ἔντερα αὐτοῦ
καὶ δέρμα ἐλεῖν | δορῆς ἅπαν καὶ εἰς τὴν φύσιν σου θεῖναι, |
{πεῖν} ἰέρακος αἶμα πελαγίου, τροφήν δὲ κάνθα|ρον σὴν. (2660)
ὁ Πὰν δὲ σὼν κατ' ὀμμάτων | γονὴν οὐ θεμιτὸν ὤσεν,
20 γίνεται κυνοκέ|φαλος ὅλη τῇ μηνιαίᾳ καθάρσει.
σὺ δ', | ἀκτιῶφι κοίρανε, μόνη τύραννε, Σελή|νη, (2665)
Τύχη θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων, νεβου|τοσουαληθ
ἴω μι, βουλλον, ενουρτιλαιη (ἄλλως· | νουμιλλον εσορτιλης
βαθυπνου |
σανκανθαθα, μιβεραθ, εντοχε, θω | ρενθα, ἴμουη, σορενθα).
25 τεῦξον πικραῖς | τιμωρίαῖς τὴν δεῖνα, τὴν ἄθεσμον, (2670)
ἦν πάλιν | ἐγὼ σοι κατὰτροπον ἐναντίως ἐλέ(γ)ξω |
(ὅσα δὲ βούλει, κοινά, ἃ λέγει πρὸς τὴν θεὸν | ἄθεσμα),
ἀναγκάσει γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τὰς | πέτρας ῥαγῆναι.

HYMN 13

1 ἄ for δεινα, throughout the hymn 2 δυσαγμα, P; μυσασμα,
A 3 ιχωρα κυνιον εμβρυον, P 10 νεως, P 19 γωνην,
P 20 γινηται, P; ἐκγίνεται, Pr (following the parallel in A) 21
μηνοτυραννε, P 26 ελεξα, P; ελεξω, A

Translation

Version B: IV 2643–74

She, NN, is offering in sacrifice to you, goddess, some hated incense,
and fat of a dappled goat, and blood and impurity,
a dog's embryo and the liquid humour of a maiden who died untimely
and the heart of a young boy together with barley and vinegar,

5

salt and a deer's horn, lentisk, myrtle,
dark(?) laurel, rashly, and crab claws,
sage, rose, a pip for you and a single onion,
garlic, shrewmouse's dung, baboon's blood,

10 an egg of a young ibis – which is illicit – she put them on your altars
11 on juniper wood. She, NN, said that you have done this thing:

12

13

14

15 for she said that you killed a man and drank his blood,
ate the flesh, she says that his bowels are your headband,
that you took all the covering of his skin and put it in your vagina,
that you drank sea-falcon's blood, and had a scarab as your food.

And Pan pushed his illicit seed against your very eyes,

20 a baboon is born with every monthly menstruation.

But you, ΑΚΤΙΩΦΗ, mistress, only absolute ruler, Selene,

Fate of gods and daimons ΝΕΒΟΥΤΟΣΟΥΑΛΕΘ

ΙΩ ΙΜΙ ΒΟΥΛΛΟΝ ΕΝΟΥΡΤΙΛΑΙΕ (otherwise: ΝΟΥΜΙΛΛΟΝ ΕΣΟΡΤΙΛΕΣ

ΒΑΘΗΡΠΝΟΥ

ΣΑΝΚΑΝΘΑΡΑ ΜΙΒΕΡΑΘ ΕΝΤΟΧΕ ΤΗΘ ΡΕΝΘΑ ΙΜΟΥΕ ΣΟΡΕΝΘΑ).

25

mark her with harsh punishments, NN, the impious one,
whom I will accuse again as she turned herself against you.

(you can use as many as you want of the usual, sacrilegious things that
she says against the goddess),

for with this spell she will compel even the rocks to break up.

COMMENTARY
COMMENTARY

1-18 We saw in the Introduction (**Intro.** p. 32) that the ritual blame shifting is a contrivance typical of Egyptian magic attested from the Pyramid Texts onwards especially in the phrase pattern ‘NN said it, not I’.²⁹² The sentence is sometimes used in a positive sense, to make the procedure more authoritative by showing that it has not been established by an ordinary man but by a divine being or force: ‘a god said it, not I’.²⁹³ In any case, the underlying principle is the same: the shifting of responsibility. This magical technique was especially developed in late Pharaonic rituals that attribute sacrilegious actions to demons or personal enemies,²⁹⁴ and is still attested in the *PDM*.²⁹⁵

1-13 The hymn opens with a list of ‘illicit’ ingredients that the impious victim is accused of having offered in sacrifice to the goddess. Interestingly enough, many of these ingredients also appear in the prose section of the spell among the constituents of the burnt offering that Pachrates, the prophet of Heliopolis, allegedly revealed to the emperor Hadrian (IV 2455-63):

Take a shrewmouse . . . two moon beetles . . . a river crab and fat of a dappled goat that is virgin and dung of a dog-faced baboon, 2 eggs of an ibis, 2 drams of storax, 2 drams of myrrh, 2 drams of crocus, 4 drams of Italian galingale, 4 drams of uncut frankincense, a single onion. Put all these things into a mortar . . . and whenever you want to perform a rite, take a little, make a charcoal fire . . . and make the offering.

²⁹² Ritner 1995a, 3368-71; Quack 1996, 331. E.g. Leitz 1999, BM EA 10042: ‘I am not the one who said it, I am not the one who repeated it. It is Maga, son of Seth, who said it, who repeated it.’

²⁹³ E.g. Sauneron 1970, 1.1-2 and (b); cf. Koenig 1981, verso I, 4 and (h).

²⁹⁴ See the examples quoted by Ritner (Schott 1929, 18-19, 22-3, 60-72, 130/15-33/8).

²⁹⁵ *PDM* xiv 643-50 [XXI 21-4], lxi 103-5 [VII 8]; cf. also III 5, 113-14, VII 593-619, XIVc 26-7.

A comparison between the two lists could suggest that some of the oddest entries of the hymn are cryptic names for more mundane ingredients (see 11.60–6). In fact, the formula ‘She, NN, is offering to you’ must imply an identification of the victim with the magician sympathetically enacting the impious burnt offering. However, the metrical section names more ingredients than the prose part, thus we are probably dealing with an imaginative widening (woman’s embryo, heart of a boy) of the offerings for the sake of strengthening the slander. For example, *ιχωρα παρθένου νεκρᾶς* in line 3A, which O’Neil in Betz translates ‘the menstrual flow of virgin dead’, could have originally referred to the dappled goat of line 2 that the prose list of ingredients describes as *παρθένος*, ‘virgin’: the sacrilegious woman would offer not only the fat, but also the blood, impurity and serum (*ιχωρα*) – or rather ‘purulent discharge’²⁹⁶ – of a dappled goat.

Whether the list reflects mundane ingredients or is a hyperbolic rendering, the entries could be symbolic of the goddess, since in 12–13A some sacrificed animals are described as her ‘greatest mystery’. Not much can be said about the single entries in connection with the goddess, but something can be inferred from the animals mentioned. Most of them are part of the Egyptian religious fauna as sacred to/symbols of various deities: the baboon and the ibis (Thoth), the falcon (Horus), the scarab (Khepri),²⁹⁷ the vulture (Nekhbet) and the shrewmouse (Uadjet and Haroeris). We are dealing with a lunar god, three solar gods and the patron goddesses of Upper and Lower Egypt: all together they could

²⁹⁶ LSJ, II.2; though it refers to a dead maiden, it is more likely to mean ‘putrefied blood’, or ‘liquid humour’, since retrieving menstrual flow from a dead woman would have been a much harder task.

²⁹⁷ The scarab can also be associated with the moon, see e.g. *PDM* xiv 239–95, where it appears in connection not only with solar deities but also with the lunar Khonsu; cf. Horapollo I.10.8–15, 24–9.

hardly be symbolic of Hecate-Selene. Though there may originally have been a different internal logic underlying the choice of these emblematic animals, it seems the main reason why they appear is because they were 'sacred' and their sacrifice was considered sacrilegious.

14–18 Cf. **8.26**. If this section still alludes to the 'mysteries' of the goddess, it would mean that the 'cruel deeds' are typical of the deity and that they are not supposed to be known by everybody. Similarly, in **15.53–4** Hecate-Selene is described as a blood-drinker heart/flesh-eater killer, which especially recalls Empousa, a female ghost/demon in the train of Hecate. She was a sort of vampire, could change into many forms and allured men by appearing like a beautiful woman in order to devour their flesh and drink their blood.²⁹⁸ Therefore, our 'cruel deeds' could have been imagined to be a typical secret activity of Hecate leader of demons, though it is hard to say that they alluded to a specific ritual performed in honour of the goddess.²⁹⁹

On the other hand, the passage does not necessarily have to contain Hecate's 'mysteries' sacrilegiously revealed to the world, but it could simply list some slanders about the goddess: actions that she did not actually commit, but that the impious victim said she did. This interpretation would fit with the statement 'you drank sea-falcon's blood, and had a scarab as your food': since they were both sacred animals, accusing the goddess of having killed them would be a great offence. If, instead, we stick to the 'mysteries' hypothesis, the phrase could allude to the solar eclipse: as both animals (the falcon and the scarab) were Egyptian representatives of the sun god, saying that Hecate-moon killed them could

²⁹⁸ Especially Philostr. *Vit. Apol.* 4.25; Aristoph. *PCG* fr. 515, *Ra.* 288–95 (and *Schol.* 293); Johnston 1995b, 365, 377–9; Johnston 1999 133–5; ghosts are generally bloodthirsty: Ogden 2001, 254–5.

²⁹⁹ Cf. Brashear 1979, 269–71.

be, at least in Greek imagery,³⁰⁰ a metaphor for the obscuration of the sun.

19–20 The passage seems to imply a non-mutual (ἀθέμιτον) love between Pan, god of flocks, and the lunar goddess. Such an intercourse is alluded to by Porphyry³⁰¹ and was probably a variant of the more popular myth of the love between Selene and the shepherd Endymion³⁰² triggered by a pun on the word πανσέληνος, ‘full moon’. The phrase seems to tell us that the union between Pan and Selene gives origin to the πανσέληνος, symbolized by the baboon – one of the animal symbols of the lunar god Thoth – and put in connection with monthly menstruations. This association between Pan and Hecate is already attested on the Hekataia, where they can appear together as deities of Nature (see 12.27–30, 10.3–5), exactly as they do in Euripides’ *Hippolytus*.³⁰³ The Anatolian Mother Goddess was associated with Pan too since she was a deity of mountains and uncontrolled nature like him (exactly like Artemis-Hecate).³⁰⁴

21 ἀκτιῶφι: Name of the moon goddess of uncertain meaning often found in the *PGM* together with Ἑρεσχιγάλ and νεβουτοσουαλήθ (see 10.14–16).

κοίρανε: More frequently qualifying male deities, see 4.2, 5 and I n.335.

μόνη τύραννε: The epithet seems to allude to the identification of Hecate with the deities of fate and their absolute dominance over men and gods (see 8.24, and especially 10.14–16, κυρία).³⁰⁵

³⁰⁰ While in Egypt an eclipse is expressed as ‘the sky devoured the disc’, and not understood as an action of the moon, see Helck, *LdÄ* ‘Mond’, 11.

³⁰¹ Porph. *De antro* 20.2–3.

³⁰² Scheer, *NP* ‘Endymion’.

³⁰³ Kraus 1960, 89, 175 no. A27, 181 no. A56; Eur. *Hipp.* 142; cf. Artemid. *Oniocr.* 2.34.12–13. For the baboon symbolizing the full moon see Leitz 1999, BM EA 10042 VIII.4.

³⁰⁴ Roller 1999, 177.

³⁰⁵ Cf. Eur. *Hec.* 816 (Peitho).

CONCLUSIONS

κραιπνή: Perhaps to be connected with the following Τύχη (Pr), but more likely used to describe the movement of the moon.³⁰⁶

22A Τύχη θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων: See 10.14–16, κυρία.

νεβουτοσουαληθ: See 10.14–16.

23–4 String of uncertain *voces magicae* among which some Greek could be recognized: λοιμου (line 23A, from λοιμός?, see 10.1); βυθουπνου (line 23A) or βαθυπνου (line 23B), possibly something like ‘with deep breath’, or ‘deep sleep’(?).

27A καλῶ σε: Cf. **Intro.** p. 30.

τριπρόσωπον θεάν: See 10.3, 12.3–7.

Μήνην, ἐράσμιον φῶς: See 11.22–4. The goddess is identified with the light of the moon.

28A See 11.25–44, **G.**

CONCLUSIONS

Almost all the hymn is constituted by the list of the victim’s sacrilegious offerings (lines 1–13) and of the cruel deeds of the goddess (lines 14–18). Then, after a short mythological reference (lines 19–20), the magician addresses the deity and states his request (lines 21–8). The direct involvement of the victim in more than half the hymn leaves no doubt that it was composed *ad hoc* in a magical milieu: lines 1–18 might be separated from the rest as ‘ritual’, but 25–6 make it clear that even the ‘praising section’ is intertwined with the magical procedure.

The use of the ritual blame shifting, the possible presence of cryptic ingredients, and most of the fauna appearing in the hymn, all point to an Egyptian background. As in 11, it is a

³⁰⁶ Cf. Dorotheus Sidonius, 386.9, 399.22; simply ‘swift’ in Hom. e.g. *Il.* 5.223, 6.505, 8.107.

matter of magical procedure, but when we turn to the nature of the goddess invoked we find attributes all traceable back to the Greek Hecate-Selene (see lines 14–18, 21–2, 27–8A). Especially to be noted is the allusion to a mythological episode based on a pun possible only in Greek (see lines 19–20).

HYMN 14

HYMN TO HECATE-SELENE- PERSEPHONE-ARTEMIS: IV 2714–83 (FOURTH CENTURY)

This hymn is the main constituent of another spell of attraction (IV 2708–84). After directions for a burnt offering, the **hymn** invokes the lunar goddess so that she torments the victim of the spell until she is subdued to the magician's love; the invocation proceeds in prose, listing other magical names and epithets, especially *voces magicae*.

Dactylic hexameters often broken by non-metrical sections.
Guide edition: Pr (also reconstructed hymn 21).³⁰⁷

δεῦρ', Ἑκάτη, γιγάεσσα, Διώνης ἥ | μεδέουσα, (2715)

Περσία, Βαυβώ, φρούνη, ἰοχέαιρα,

ἄδμήτη, Λυδή, | ἰαδμάστωρ, εὐπατόρεια, |

5 δαδοῦχε, ἡγεμόνη, κατα(καμ)ψυψαύχε|νε, Κούρη·
κλῦθι, διαζεύξα|σα | πύλας ἀλύτου ἀδάμαντος, (2720)

Ἄρτε|μι, ἥ καὶ πρόσθεν ἐπίσκοπος ἦσ(θ)α, | μεγίστη,

πότνια, ῥηξίχθων, σκυλακάγεια, πανδαμάτειρα,

εινοδία, | τρικάρανε, φασφόρε, παρθέ|νε | σεμνή· (2725)

σὲ καλῶ, ἔλλοφόν|α, | (δο)λόεσσα, Αἰδωναία,

πολύμορφε· |

10 δεῦρ', Ἑκάτη, τριοδί|τι, πυρίπνοα | φάσματ' ἔχουσα,
χᾶτ' ἔλαχες | δεινὰς μὲν ὁδοὺς, χαλεπὰς δ' ἐπι|πομπάς. (2730)

τὰν Ἑκάταν σε καλῶ | σὺν ἀποφθιμένοι|σιν ἰώροις, |

κεῖ τινες ἡρώων ἔθανον ἀγύ|ναιοί τε ἄπαιδες,

ἄγρια συρίζοντες, | ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸν ἔχοντες,

15 (οἱ δέ· ἀνέμων εἰδωλον ἔχοντες)· |

³⁰⁷ Cf. Diltthey 1872, 392–405; Fauth 2006, 61–3.

- στάντες ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς τῆς δεῖνα ἀφέλε|σθε αὐτῆς (2735)
 τὸν γλυκὺν ὕπνον, |
 μηδέποτε βλέφαρον βλεφάρῳ κολ|λητὸν ἐπέλθοι,
 τειρέσθω δ' ἐπ' ἐ|μαῖς φιλαγρύπνοισι μερίμναις. |
 εἰ δέ τιν' ἄλλον ἔχουσ' ἐν κόλποις κατὰκειται, | (2740)
 20 κεῖνον ἀπώσασθω, ἐμὲ δ' ἐν φρεσὶν ἐγ|καταθέσθω,
 καὶ προλιποῦσα τάχιστα | ἐπ' ἐμοῖς προθύροισι παρέστω,
 δαμνο|μένη ψυχῇ ἐπ' ἐμῇ φιλότῃ καὶ εὐνῇ. |
 ἀλλὰ σύ, ὦ Ἑκάτη, πολυώνυμε, παρθέ|νε, Κούρα, (2745)
 (δο)λόεσσα, (κ)έλομαι, ἄλως φυ|λακὰ καὶ ἰωγή,
 25 Περσεφώνα, τρικά|ρανε, πυρίφοιτε, βοῶπι,
 βουορφορβη | πανφορβα φορβαρά ἀκτιῶφι,
 Ἑρeschi|γάλ (2750)
 νεβουτοσουαληθ· παρὰ θύραις πυ|πυληδεδεζω ῥήξι|πύλη τε.
 δεῦρ' Ἑκά|τη, πυρίβουλε, καλῶ σε ἐπ' ἐμαῖς ἐπα|οιδαῖς·
 μασκελλι μασκελλω φνου|κενταβαωθ ὄρεοβαζάγρα
 ῥηξίχθων |
 30 ἱπόχθων, ὄρεοπηγανύξ, μορμο|ροντοκουμβαι κοι(νόν). (2755)
 μαινομένη ἢ δεῖνα | ἦκοι ἐπ' ἐμαῖσι θύραισι τάχιστα,
 λη|θομένη τέκνων συνηθείης τε το|κῆων
 καὶ στυγέουσα τὸ πᾶν ἀνδρῶν | γένος ἡδὲ γυναικῶν (2760)
 ἐκτὸς ἐμοῦ, | τοῦ δεῖνα, μόνον με δ' ἔχουσα παρέστω, |
 35 ἐν φρεσὶ δαμνομένη κρατερῆς | ὑπ' ἔρωτος ἀνάγκης.
 θενωβ | τιθεληβ ἡνωρ τενθηνωρ, | πολυώνυμε, (2765)
 κυζαλεουσα
 παζαους, | διὸ καλλιδηχμα καὶ σαβ | ...

2767–82: Non-metrical section

σπεῦδε τάχιστα, | ἥδη ἐπ' ἐμαῖσι θύραισι παρέστω. |

1 διηνῆς, P (the first η is cancelled, above it ω); Διώνης, Pr; Δηωίνη, Reitz. 4 καταψυκαυχε|να, P; κατα(καμ)ψυψαύχενε, Wunsch and Pr, fitting the metre; καταψυχαύχενε, Bortolani 5 κλυτου, P 6 μι και προσμε, P 9 ελλεφωνα λωεσσα αυδναια, P (see Pr apparatus); Αυδναία, Pr; Αἰδωναία, Reitz., Wunsch 10 τριο-
 τιδι, P 11 κατελαχες, P 14 ἔδοντες, Pr 16 4 for δεῖνα, throughout the hymn 20 εν|καταθεσθω, P 24 λοεσσα ελο-
 μαι αλωος φυλακα και ἰωπη, P; (ἐ)λθέ, θεά, (κ)έλομαι, ἄλως

HYMN TO HECATE-SELENE-PERSEPHONE-ARTEMIS

φυ|λακὰ καὶ ἰωγή, Pr; (δο)λόεσσα, (κ)έλομαι, Bortolani (unmet-
 rical) 25 βοωπη, P 31 μαινομενηηδηκαι επεμαισι, P 32
 δε, P 34 εἰς τοδε εμου | του ♀, P

Translation

Come here, Hecate, giant, protectress of Dione,
 Persia, Baubo, toad, shooter of arrows,
 untamed, Lydian, unsubdued, daughter of a noble father,
 torch-bearer, guide, who bends down haughty necks, Core,
 5 listen, you who have separated doors of indestructible steel,
 Artemis, who were once overseer, mightiest one,
 lady, who burst out from the earth, dog-leader, all-tamer,
 guardian of the roads, three-headed, light-bringer, revered maiden;
 I call you, fawn-slayer, cunning, of Hades, with many forms:
 10 come here, Hecate, goddess of the crossroads, with fire-blowing ghosts,
 to whom have been assigned dreadful roads and harsh witchcrafts.
 I call you Hecate with those who died untimely,
 and those among the heroes who may have died without a wife and
 children,
 hissing wildly, with animosity in their hearts
 15 [others say: with the appearance of winds].
 All of you, take away the sweet sleep from her, standing above her,
 NN, head,
 and may eyelid never join eyelid,
 but may she be tormented by sleepless thoughts of me.
 And if she lies keeping someone else on her bosom,
 20 may she repel him, and place me in her heart,
 and, deserting him as soon as possible, may she be at my door
 subdued in her soul by my bed of love.
 But you, O Hecate, of many names, maiden, Core,
 cunning, I call you, guard and shelter of the threshing floor,
 25 Persephone, three-headed, who roam fierily, with bovine eyes,
 BOUORPHORBĒ PANPHORBA PHORBARA AKTIŌPHI ERESCHIGAL
 NEBOUTOSOUALĒTH, beside the doors, PYPYLĒDEDEZŌ, who break
 the doors.
 Come here, Hecate, with fiery will, I call you to my charms;
 MASKELLI MASKELLŌ PHNOUKENTABAŌTH who hunt walking in the
 mountains, who burst out from the earth,

- 30 chthonic mare, OREOPĒGANYX MORMORON TOKOUMBAl (as usual).
 May she, NN, come mad to my doors as soon as possible,
 forgetting her children and her habits with parents
 and abhorring all the race of men and women
 but me, NN, and may she be here having intercourse with me alone,
 35 subdued in her heart by the strong constraint of passion.
 THENŌB TITHELĒB ĒNŌR TENTHĒNŌR, of many names, KYZALEOUSA
 PAZAOUS, therefore KALLIDĒCHMA and SAB. . .

Lines 2767–78

Hasten as quickly as possible, may she already be here at my doors.

COMMENTARY

1 γιγᾶεσσα: Possibly underlining the monstrousness of the goddess as in Lucian's *Philopseudes*, where Hecate appearing to Eucrates is described as about three hundred feet high, and carrying a proportionate thirty-foot sword.³⁰⁸

Διώνης ἡ μεδέουσα: The papyrus seems to have Διώνης, Dione, name of the goddess mother of Aphrodite or of Aphrodite herself. An identification of Hecate with one of these two goddesses would not create any problem (see 10.3–5, 11.25–44, C, Δωδωνίη, 12.23, 27–30),³⁰⁹ but she is said to be the 'protectress', 'guardian' of either Dione or Aphrodite, which hardly makes sense, especially considering that we would normally expect a place name as the object of μεδέουσα. Reitzenstein³¹⁰ suggested reading Δηωίνη, 'daughter of Deo (Demeter)', i.e. Persephone (see 10.3–5), hence 'protectress of Persephone', which would fit Hecate but not the metre. Alternatively, Hecate

³⁰⁸ Luc. *Philops.* 22.13–5; cf. Pr apparatus.

³⁰⁹ Cf. the magical object from Pergamon (II n.34) where ΔΙΩΝΗ appears as a name of Hecate; also on a similar object from Apamea, see Mastrocinque 2002, especially 176–7.

³¹⁰ Pr apparatus.

could be directly identified with Dione and, since in this case μεδέουσα would not have an object, another possibility would be to consider μεδέουσα a mistake for Μέδουσα, ‘Medusa’ (see 10.5 γοργῶπι, 11.58 ἵππος): the line might have hypothetically looked like δεῦρ’, Ἑκάτη, γιγάεσσα, Δώνη – ~ Μέδουσα, ‘come here, Hecate, giant, Dione . . . Medusa’. However, the gap is not easy to fill and a third solution may be possible. In fact, the reading of the papyrus is γιγαεσσα διωνησ and thus an original γιγαεσσ’ Αἰδωνη(ο)ς may be suggested (cf. 14.9, Αἰδωναία). The copyist, not recognizing the term Aidoneus (poetical for Hades), may have divided the words in the wrong way and then inverted ιδ in δι in order to find a sense for the remaining ιδωνης or ιδωνηος. Thus the verse may originally have been δεῦρ’, Ἑκάτη, γιγάεσσ’, Αἰδωνῆος μεδέουσα, ‘come here, Hecate, giant, guardian of Hades’.³¹¹ If this were the case, the mistake must have happened at an earlier stage of transmission: see 14.9.

2 Περσία, ιοχέαιρα: See 11.25–44, C.

Βαυβώ: In the Orphic version of the Eleusinian myth, Baubo was a woman from Eleusis who, showing her genitals, succeeded in making Demeter laugh when she was grieving for the loss of her daughter, while, according to Michael Psellus, Baubo was an Orphic nocturnal daimon.³¹² Apart from the role played by Baubo and Hecate in the Eleusinian mysteries, their connection in the *PGM* was probably triggered by the assonance between Baubo and βαυβίζω, βαυβύζω, βαύζω, ‘to bark’, and βαύ βαύ, ‘bow bow’, imitating the dog’s bark.³¹³

³¹¹ From the metrical point of view, though the alpha of Αἰδωνεύς is generally long, it is short in Homer (cf. *Il.* 5.190).

³¹² E.g. Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 391, 396; Hesych. B 356; Graf, *NP* ‘Baubo’; Graf 1974, 165–71, 194–9; Guthrie 1993, 135–7; Richardson 1974, 213–17; cf. Marcovich 1986; Fauth 2006, 32–40.

³¹³ Cf. Βαυβώ appearing together with φορβα (see 10.3–5 βορβορ-οφόρβα) in IV 1256–61, 2202–3.

φρούνη: Late form for Φρόνη, it can be a female personal name, Phroune, or be intended as the noun φρόνη, 'toad'. The Egyptian Heket, goddess of fertility and childbirth, was usually represented with a frog head, but more probably the epithet was attributed to Hecate thanks to the popular image that saw the toad as the animal of witches owing to the toxicity of its skin – and the frog as an Underworld animal.³¹⁴ Moreover, 'toad' could be used here as a nickname meaning 'hag',³¹⁵ resembling other Hecate's epithets such as 'horrible' (see 12.19=15.48).

3 ἀδμήτη, ἀδαμάστωρ: Interestingly, Homer uses ἀδμητος in the meaning of 'untamed' for heifers, mares and mules (see 11.58 ἵππος),³¹⁶ and when its meaning evolves to 'virgin' it can be found as an epithet of Artemis and other maiden goddesses such as Persephone (see 10.3–5).³¹⁷ Ἀδάμαστος appears in Homer as an epithet of 'inexorable' Hades, but later it is often found in connection with untamed animals especially horses (see 11.58).³¹⁸ In the *OH* it is an epithet of Nature and in the *PGM* it is used for Aphrodite 'Nature, mother of all' (see 12.27–30, 15.32–6).³¹⁹

Λυδή: Possibly referring to Artemis, whose cult was widespread in Lydia.³²⁰

εὐπατόρεια: Another Homeric epithet that normally implies a parentage with Zeus. The poet uses it for Helen,³²¹

³¹⁴ Hünemörder, *NP* 'Frog' A–B; Weber, *RAC* 'Frosch'; cf. Betz 1992, 89 no. 335.

³¹⁵ Cf. Aristoph. *Ec.* 1101.

³¹⁶ Hom. *Il.* 10.293, 23.266, 23.655, *Od.* 3.383, 4.637.

³¹⁷ E.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 149; Soph. *El.* 1239, *OC* 1321 (Atalanta); Apoll. Rhod. 4.897 (Persephone).

³¹⁸ Hom. *Il.* 9.158; e.g. Xenoph. *Mem.* 4.1.3, 7, *De re equest.* 1.1.14; Plu. *De lib.* 2f2.

³¹⁹ *OH* 10.3; also for male deities 4.7 (Uranus), 12.2 (Heracles owing to his strength), 65.2 (Ares as god of war). IV 2917. Cf. Nonn. *Dion.* 2.223 (Eros). Cf. Van den Broek 1996, 48–51.

³²⁰ E.g. Hdt. 1.26.4–5; Callim. *Hym.* 3.237–8; Strab. 13.4.5.24–30, 14.1.22–3; Paus. 4.31.8.1–5, 7.2.6.8–8.1. Graf, *NP* 'Artemis', A.

³²¹ Hom. *Il.* 6.292, *Od.* 22.227.

but it can later be found in connection with Artemis, Athena-Nike,³²² and other deities such as Aphrodite and the Moirai.³²³ Hecate too is called εὐπατέρεια in an Orphic fragment identifying her with Persephone (see 10.4 Περσέφασσα).³²⁴

4 δαδοῦχε: See 12.32.

ἡγεμόνη: Epithet of Artemis³²⁵ used in Orphic literature also for Hecate.³²⁶ Apart from the identification Hecate-Artemis (see 10.3–5), the goddess could have obtained it thanks to her role of ‘guide of the dead’, especially if we consider that Hermes, with whom she shared the psychopomp function, had the epithet ἡγεμόνιος.³²⁷

κατα(καμ)ψυσαύχενε: Preisendanz prefers this suggestion by Wunsch, which I kept in the text since it fits the metre. The term (from κατακάμπτω, ‘bend down’ + ὑψαύχην, ‘with high neck’, ‘haughty’) seems to echo the image of the ‘yoke of Necessity set around the necks of men’,³²⁸ and thus could have been chosen on account of the identification of Hecate with Ananke, Tyche and the Moirai (see 10.1, 14–16, κυρία). Nevertheless, considering that the papyrus has καταψυκαυχένα and that the metre is often faulty in the hymn, the copyist could have had in mind the non-

³²² E.g. Eur. *Hipp.* 68; Menand. *Dysc.* 968; Apoll. Rhod. 1.570.

³²³ *OH* 55.10, 59.16; but also 79.1 for Themis daughter of Uranus.

³²⁴ Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 400.

³²⁵ E.g. Paus. 3.14.7.1, 8.37.1.2–3, especially 8.47.6 recounting why Artemis obtained it (see Callim. *Hym.* 3.227, Bornmann 1968, *ad loc.*).

³²⁶ Orph. *Arg.* 909 (Artemis-Hecate ‘at the door’), *OH* 1.8 (Koops 1932, *ad loc.*), 72.3 (Tyche identified with Artemis-Hecate), also for Nature 10.12 (see 12.27–30, 15.32–6).

³²⁷ Aristoph. *Pl.* 1159, and *Scholia ad loc.* and 1153; Cornut. 24.1–5; Arrian, *Cyn.* 35.3.3–4.1; *Scholia in Plat. Ig.* 914b.

³²⁸ Richardson 1974, *ad HH* 2.216–17; Eur. *Or.* 1330; Moschio, *TrGF* fr. 2: ὦ καὶ θεῶν κρατοῦσα καὶ θνητῶν μόνη | μοῖρ’, ὃ λιταῖς ἄτρωτε δυστήνων βροτῶν, | πάντολμ’ ἀνάγκη, στυγνὸν ἢ κατ’ αὐχένων | ἡμῶν ἐρείδεις τῆσδε λατρείας ζυγόν, ‘O Moira, only mistress of gods and mortals, untouched by the prayers of unhappy men, all-daring Necessity, who push down on our necks the hateful yoke of this slavery’.

metrical reading καταψυχάχενε, from καταψύχω, 'chill', + αὔχην, 'neck', meaning 'who chills the necks', in the sense of 'to seize with a chill', 'make shiver with fear' (cf. LSJ καταψύχω I.1). The term would fit with the image of Hecate as fearsome, ghostly goddess (e.g. lines 10–11).

Κούρη: Also at 23, see 10.4.

5 Hecate is described in her role of mediator between different worlds as capable of opening the doors of the Underworld (see 10.3–5, 4 κλειδοῦχε). Possibly an echo of Theocritus' *Idyll* 2.33–4: καὶ τὸν ἐν Ἅϊδα κινήσαις ἀδάμαντα καὶ εἴ τί περ ἀσφαλὲς ἄλλο, 'as you (Artemis-Hecate) could move the steel of Hades, may you move all else that is sturdy'.

6 A concise *hypomnēsis* reminding the goddess that she already protected the magician.

μεγίστη: Though occasionally appearing in connection with other deities,³²⁹ **μεγίστη** is a standard epithet of Isis,³³⁰ and is frequently attested also for Hecate in Asia Minor.³³¹

7 πότνια: A generic epithet that can be applied to many different goddesses, among whom are Artemis,³³² Demeter and/or Persephone,³³³ Aphrodite,³³⁴ Moirai, Tyche, Erinyes,³³⁵ and Hecate herself.³³⁶

³²⁹ E.g. Gaea: Solon, fr. 36.4 (West); Anaxag. *Test.* 112 (Diels and Kranz). Athena: Soph. *OC* 107; Procl. *In Plat. Rem.* 2.121.9–10 (Hecate encompassing the whole world).

³³⁰ E.g. VIII 22; Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.26, 2.1, 4.1; Xenoph. *Ephes.* 4.3.3.3, 5.13.4.3; Bernand and Bernand 1969, *passim*; Bricault 1996, 45–51; Kockelmann 2008, 49–50.

³³¹ Many attestations in Laumonier 1958, 420–1; Kraus 1960, 43–4.

³³² E.g. Hom. *Il.* 21.470; Eur. *Hipp.* 61, *Ph.* 190, *IA* 1524; Callim. *Hym.* 3.136, 210; *OH* 36.11.

³³³ E.g. *HH* 2.39 (Richardson 1974, *ad loc.*), 47, 54; Soph. *OC* 1050; Aristoph. *Ra.* 336; Callim. *Hym.* 6.10, 49.

³³⁴ E.g. Sappho, fr. 1.4 (Lobel and Page); Pind. *Pyth.* 4.213; Eur. fr. Phaeth. 229, 231 (Diggle).

³³⁵ E.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 887, 976; Eur. *IA* 1136; Soph. *OC* 84; Aristoph. *Th.* 700.

³³⁶ E.g. Eur. *Ph.* 109; Theocr. 2.43.

ρήξιθων: In the *OH*³³⁷ it is an epithet of Dionysus, possibly alluding to the sprouting of the grapevine from the earth. In the great majority of its occurrences in the *PGM* it is part of the so-called MASKELLI-MASKELLŌ formula (see lines 29–30): in these cases, the proximity of *ρήξιθων* and *ἰπόχθων* recalls the myth of Demeter-mare and the birth of Arion (see 11.58 ἵππος) who, according to Antimachus, was the offspring of Gaea-Earth who ‘sent him up’ from herself.³³⁸

σκυλακάγεια: See 10.30.

πανδαμάτειρα: Another epithet that seems to refer to Hecate’s identification with the deities of fate (see 10.14–16, κυρία, 15.42).³³⁹

8 εἰνοδία: See 10.30.

τρικάρανε: Also at 25, see 10.3–5.

φασφόρε: See 12.23.

παρθένε: Also at 23, see 10.3–5.

σεμνή: Divine epithet especially used for the Erinyes, euphemistically called the σεμναὶ θεαί.³⁴⁰ Common in the *OH* as epithet of Prothyraia (cf. 10.4, κλειδοῦχε), Persephone, Artemis and Aphrodite.³⁴¹

9–10 ἔλλοφónα: Used only by Callimachus³⁴² as an epithet of Britomartis, originally a Cretan deity transformed by Greek mythology into a nymph identified with Artemis and subsequently with Hecate.

⟨δο⟩λόεσσα: Also at line 24. See 11.25–44, **F**.

³³⁷ *OH* 50.5, 52.9. Cf. Dilthey 1872, 408.

³³⁸ Antimachus, fr. 32 (Wyss); cf. Paus. 8.25.9. Ritoók 1978, 439–42.

³³⁹ E.g. Soph. *Ph.* 1467 (daimon); Apoll. Rhod. 4.475–6 (Erinyes); common in the *OH* for different deities: 5.3 (Ouranos), 10.3, 26 (Nature), 27.12 (Mother of the gods), 66.5 (Hephaestus).

³⁴⁰ E.g. Aesch. *Eu.* 383; Soph. *Aj.* 837, *El.* 112, *OC* 90, 458; Eur. *Or.* 410; Aristoph. *Eq.* 1312 (and *Schol.*); Cornut. 11.9–10; Harpocration, *Lexicon* 271.11.

³⁴¹ *OH* 2.12, 29.10, 36.2, 55.2.

³⁴² Callim. *Hym.* 3.190 (Bornmann 1968, *ad loc.*); *Scholia in Eur. Hipp.* 146; *Etymol. Gen.* B 266; *Etymol. Mag.* 331.54–332.4.

Αἰδωναία: Feminine adjective from the Homeric Αἰδωνεύς, ‘Aidoneus’, poetical form of Ἅιδης, ‘Hades’. The papyrus has αὐδναία, but the emendation Αἰδωναία is supported by hymn 15.47 where the term is correctly spelled. This misspelling of the feminine of Αἰδωνεύς supports the hypothesis that the copyist of this hymn did not recognize this word at line 1 (see Commentary *ad loc.*). At the same time, Αἰδωναία is correctly spelled in 15.47 and in the papyrus both hymns are written by the same hand, which seems to suggest that both mistakes (here and at line 1) must have happened at an earlier stage of transmission.

πολύμορφε: The connection of this epithet with female lunar deities manifesting themselves in the different phases of the moon has already been discussed (see 8.26).³⁴³ The possible Egyptian equivalent *ḥ3-ḥprw*, ‘with many forms’, is mainly used for solar deities, though it can be found also with lunar ones. It can also be an epithet of Isis in connection with her polyonymy (see line 23).³⁴⁴

πυρίπνοα φάσματ’ ἔχουσα: See 12.32.

11 Hecate goddess of crossroads and witchcraft, see 10.2, 3–5.

12–15 See 10.2, 6–12.

14–15 Though φρεσὶ θυμὸν ἔχοντες appears in *Iliad* 13.487, it has been suggested that the line should be corrected to θυμὸν ἔδοντες as in *Odyssey* 9.75, 10.143, ‘eating (our) hearts (for weariness and pains)’.³⁴⁵ The variant ἀνέμων εἰδῶλον ἔχοντες, though obscure, could refer to the ghostly appearance of these dead heroes.

16–22 See 10.22–8.

³⁴³ Cf. also the epithet ποικιλόμορφε, ‘with many shapes’, found in the hymn to Tyche of P. Berlin 9734; see Furley 2010, 169. The term seems here to refer to the many turns of Fate, and thus also πολύμορφε could have a similar shade of meaning considering the association between Hecate and the deities of fate, see 10.14–16, κυρία.

³⁴⁴ *LGG* II.220. E.g. Isis-Hathor on the healing statue of Psammetik-Seneb: Kákosy 1999, 55 (VI.1). Bricault 1996, 61.

³⁴⁵ Pr apparatus.

φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ: Homeric.³⁴⁶

23 πολύνυμς: Also at 36. The epithet appears first in the *Homeric Hymn* to Demeter as a euphemistic way to avoid referring directly to Hades.³⁴⁷ Subsequently, in the meaning of ‘worshipped under many titles’, ‘very renowned’, it can be found in connection with many deities.³⁴⁸ Hecate-moon as **πολύμορφος** (see line 9, and 8.26) could easily be **πολύνυμς** (see 10.3–5, **τρικάρανε**),³⁴⁹ and the epithet became especially typical of Isis thanks to her identification with most of the female Mediterranean deities (see **Intro.** pp. 9–10).³⁵⁰ In Egyptian tradition the equivalent *ḥ3t-mw*, ‘with many names’, could be used for female deities, but it was especially employed for solar gods, who were richest in manifestations, and for Amun, the ‘hidden one who made himself into millions’.³⁵¹

24 The reading of the line is very uncertain. Instead of Preisendanz’s suggestion **ἐλθέ, θεά, κέλομαι**, I prefer to keep the unmetrical **δολόεσσα, κέλομαι** as closer to the papyrus reading. **Φυλακά** can be an epithet of Demeter³⁵² and **ἄλωος φυλακά** could thus refer to the production of cereals. Alternatively, **ἄλωος** could be used in its meaning of ‘moon disc’.³⁵³

25 Περσεφόνα: See 10.4.

³⁴⁶ Hom. *Il.* 3.445, 6.25, *Od.* 5.126, 23.219.

³⁴⁷ Richardson 1974, *ad HH* 2.18.

³⁴⁸ E.g. *HH* 3.82 (Apollo); Pind. *Isth.* 5.1 (Theia); Soph. *Ant.* 1115 (Dinoysus); Bacchyl. *Epigr.* 1.1 (Irigoin) (Nike); Aristoph. *Th.* 320 (Artemis); Theocr. 15.109 (Aphrodite); Callim. *Hym.* 3.7 (Artemis, Bornmann 1968, *ad loc.*); Cleanth. fr. 1.1 (Powell) (Zeus); *OH*, *passim*; Procl. *Hym.* 2.1 (Erotes, Van den Berg 2001, *ad loc.*).

³⁴⁹ E.g. *OH* 2.1 (Prothyraia-Hecate); Nonn. *Dion.* 44.191–3 (Hecate-moon), Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad loc.*; Procl. *Hym.* 6.1.

³⁵⁰ E.g. Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.26; Bricault 1996, 61; Witt 1971, 111–29; Fauth 2006, 128–30.

³⁵¹ *LGG* II.217, 225 (*ḥ3t-mw*); cf. **Intro.** p. 46; cf. Brunner-Traut, *LdÄ* ‘Anonymität’, 281–91, D.

³⁵² E.g. *IG* IX.2.573; *SEG* 17.288.

³⁵³ LSJ, II.

πυρίφοιτε: Usually translated ‘walking in fire’, but possibly meaning ‘who roams fiercely’, as *πυρίδρομος*, ‘fiery in its course’, appearing in the *OH* in connection with astral bodies.³⁵⁴

βοῶπι: See 12.23. The term is a common epithet of Hera in Homer, but can be used also for other deities, e.g. Pluto (Hes. *Th.* 355), as a metaphorical way to depict large, soft eyes.

26–7 βουορφορβη πανφορβα φορβαρα: See 10.3–5.

ἄκτιῶφι: See 13.21.

Ἑρεσχιγάλ νεβουτοσουαληθ: See 10.14–16.

παρὰ θύραις, ῥήξιπύλη: Epithets expressing the traditional role of Hecate protectress and key-holder of the *limen*, see 10.3–5, 4.

πυπυληδεδεξω: Certainly alluding to the doors opened by Hecate (πύλη).³⁵⁵

28 πυρίβουλε: This *hapax* seems to allude to the demonic nature of the goddess (see 10.17–18, 12.32, *πυρίπνου*).

ἐπ’ ἐμαῖς ἐπαιοιδαῖς: Cf. 1.22, 27, 2.17.

29–30 μασκελλι μασκελλω φνουκενταβαωθ ὀρεοβαζάγρα ῥηξίχθων ἱππόχθων, ὀρεοπηγανύξ: See line 7, ῥηξίχθων. The so-called MASKELLI-MASKELLŌ formula. Instead of the standard *πυριπηγανύξ* (‘who tramps on springs of fire’?), we find here *ὀρεοπηγανύξ*, possibly meaning ‘who tramps on the mountain springs’, which seems to connect Hecate with Artemis as *ὀρεοβαζάγρα* (see 12.35, *ὀρίπλανε*).³⁵⁶

30 μορμοροντοκουμβαι: Probably deriving from *μόρμορος*/μέρμερος, ‘baneful’, and *μορμολύττομαι*, ‘to frighten’, as the name of the child-killing demon Mormo (see 11.25–44, *E*, *λυκώ*).³⁵⁷

31–5 See 10.22–8.

36–7 Uncertain *voces magicae*. *καλλιδηχμα* could mean something like ‘with beautiful bites/stings of pain’ referring to the

³⁵⁴ *OH* 7.9 (stars); 8.11 (Helios).

³⁵⁵ *Pr* apparatus.

³⁵⁶ Ritoók 1978, 437–42; Thissen 1991, 297–8.

³⁵⁷ BG; Mastrocinque 2003, 105.

CONCLUSIONS

compelling action of the goddess which is ‘beautiful’ as it will fulfil the magician’s desires; **σαβ** could be the beginning of **Σαβαώθ** (see 3.21, 22).

CONCLUSIONS

The hymn develops in a structure in which *epiclēsis* (lines 1–9, 23–30) alternates with *euchē* (lines 10–22, 31–7). Even in this case (cf. **10**), the nature of the magician’s requests leaves no doubt that the hymn – in its extant state – was composed for erotic magic, adopting the standard Greek formulary (see **10.22–8**). Contrary to **10**, **11** and **13**, in this case the passages referring to the magical procedure can more easily be separated from the rest of the composition (lines 12–22, 31–8), so that they might be considered as originally free-standing sections pasted into the hymn.

Again all the divine attributes find a connection with Hecate-Selene, and even when they could imply an Egyptian influence (see lines 6, **μεγίστη**, 9, **πολύμορφε**, 23, **πολυώνυμε**, 25, **βοῶπι**) they do not alter the ‘theology’ of the goddess. Interestingly, lunar traits are very scant (cf. **10** where they were missing): the only certain one is **πολύμορφε** (line 9), while **δαδοῦχε** (line 4), **φαεσφόρε** (line 8) and **βοῶπι** (line 25) can have more than one interpretation. As a result, the deity invoked looks even closer to the traditional Hecate.

HYMN 15

HYMN TO HECATE-SELENE- PERSEPHONE-ARTEMIS: IV 2786–870 (FOURTH CENTURY)

This long metrical section is the main constituent of a spell entitled ‘prayer to Selene for any procedure’ (IV 2785–890) that can be used both for doing ‘good’ and ‘harm’.

- Invocation: The **hymn** invokes the lunar goddess so that she may fulfil the magician’s desires.
- Offerings: Two lists of different ingredients to be used as burnt offerings either for beneficial or hostile purpose.
- Protective charm: The magician has to engrave a lodestone with a three-faced Hecate and consecrate it by dipping it in blood.

Dactylic hexameters. Guide edition: Pr (also reconstructed hymn 18).³⁵⁸

ἐλθέ μοι, ὦ δέσποινα φίλη, τριπρόσωπε Σελήνη,
εὐμενίη δ’ ἐπάκουσον ἐμῶν ἱερῶν ἐπαοιδῶν, | (2790)
νυκτὸς ἄγαλμα, νέα, φαεσίμβροτε, | ἡριγένεια,

5 ἡ χαροποῖς ταύροισιν | ἐφεζομένη, βασίλεια,
ἡελίου | δρόμον ἶσον ἐν ἄρμασιν ἱππέουσιν,
ἡ Χαρίτων τρισσῶν τρισσαῖς | μορφαῖσι χορεύεις
ἀστράσιν κωμᾶζουσα, Δίκη καὶ νήματα Μοιρῶν, | (2795)

Κλωθὼ καὶ Λάχσις ἡδ’ Ἄτροπος εἴ, τριψκάρανε, |
Περσεφόνη τε Μέγαιρα καὶ Ἀλληκτώ, | πολύμορφε,
10 ἡ χέρας ὀπλίζουσα | κελαιναῖς λαμπάσι δειναῖς, (2800)
ἡ φοιβερῶν ὀφίων χαίτην σείουσα μετώποις,

³⁵⁸ Cf. Fauth 2006, 63–6.

- ἡ ταύρων μύκημα κατὰ στομάτων ἀνιῖσα,
 ἡ νηδὺν φολεῖσιν πεπυκασμένη ἐρπυστήρων, |
 ἰοβόλοις ταρσοῖσιν κατωμαδίοις | δρακόντων, (2805)
 15 σφιγγομένη κατὰ | νῶτα παλαμναίοις ὑπὸ δεσμοῖς, |
 νυκτιβόη, ταυρωπι, φιλήρεμε, ταυροκάρηνε,
 ὄμμα δέ σοι | ταυρωπόν, ἔχεις σκυλακώδεα φωλὴν, (2810)
 μορφὰς δ' ἐν κήμαισιν | ὑποσκεπάουσα λεόντων,
 μορφόλυκον σφυρόν ἐστιν, κύνες φίλοι | ἀγριόθυμοι·
 20 τοῦνεκά σε κλῆζουσι | Ἑκάτην, πολυώνυμε, Μήνην, | (2815)
 ἀέρα μὲν τέμνουσαν, ἅτ' Ἄρτεμιν | ἰοχέαιραν,
 τετραπρόσωπε θεά, | τετραώνυμε, τετραοδίτι,
 Ἄρτεμι, Περσεφόνη, ἐλαφηβόλε, νυκτοφάνεια, (2820)
 τρίκυπε, τρίφθογγε, | τρικάρανε, τριώνυμε Σελήνη, |
 25 θρινακία, τριπρόσωπε, τριαύχενε καὶ τριοδίτι,
 ἡ τρισσοῖς ταλάροιςιν ἔχεις φλογὸς ἀκάματον πῦρ |
 καὶ τριόδων μεδέεις τρισσῶν δεκάδων τε ἀνάσσεις· (2825)
 ἴλαθί μοι καλέοντι καὶ εὐμενέως εἰσάκουσον, |
 ἡ πολυχώρητον κόσμον νυκτὸς | ἀμφιέπουσα,
 30 δαίμονες ἦν φρίσσουσιν καὶ ἀθάνατοι τρομέουσιν, | (2830)
 κυδιάνειρα θεά, πολυώνυμε, καλλιγένεια,
 ταυρωπι, κερόεσσα, θεῶν | γενέτειρα καὶ ἀνδρῶν
 καὶ Φύσι | παμμήτωρ· σὺ γὰρ φοιτᾷς ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ, (2835)
 εὐρεῖαν δέ τ' ἄβυσσον | ἀπείριτον ἀμφιπολεύεις.
 35 ἀρχὴ | καὶ τέλος εἶ, πάντων δὲ σὺ μούνη | ἀνάσσεις·
 ἐκ σέο γὰρ πάντ' ἐστὶ | καὶ εἰς (σ'), αἰών(ι)ε, πάντα τελευτᾷ.
 ἀέναον διάδημα ἐοῖς φορέεις κροτάφοισιν, (2840)
 δεσμοὺς ἀρρήκτους, ἀλύτους μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο
 καὶ χρύσειον σκήπτρον εἰς κατέχεις παλάϊμαισιν.
 40 γράμματα σὺ σκήπτρῳ | αὐτὸς Κρόνος ἀμφεχάραξεν, (2845)
 δῶκε δέ σοι φορέειν, ὅφρ' ἔμπεδα πάντα μένοιεν·
 δαμνῶ, δαμνομένηαι δαμασάνδρα δαμνοδαμία. |
 σὺ δὲ χάους μεδέεις ἀραραχαράρα ηφθισικηρε. (2850)
 χαῖρε, θεά, καὶ | σαῖσιν ἐπωνυμίαις ἐπάκουσον. |
 45 θῶ σοι τὸδ' ἄρωμα, Διὸς τέκος, | ἰοχέαιρα,
 οὐρανία, λιμ(ε)νίτι, | ὀρίπλανε εἰνοδία τε,
 νερτεῖρία νυχία τε, Αἰδωναία σκοτία τε, | (2855)
 ἥσυχε καὶ δασπλήτι, τάφοις | ἐνι δαῖτα ἔχουσα,

- Νύξ, Ἑρεβος, | Χάος εὐρύ· σὺ γὰρ δυσάλυκτος | Ἀνάγκη,
 50 Μοῖρα δ' ἔφυς, σύ τ' | Ἑρινύς, βάσανος, ὀλέτις σύ, Δίκη σύ. |(2860)
 Κέρβερον ἐν δεσμοῖσιν ἔχεις, | φολίσιν σὺ δρακόντων· |
 κυανέα, ὄφροπλόκαμε καὶ | ζωνοδράκοντι,
 αἰμοπότι, | θανατηγέ, φθορηγενές, καρδίόδ{ι}αιτε, (2865)
 σαρκοφάγε καὶ | ἄωροβόρε, καπετόκτυπε, | οἰστροπλάνεια,
 55 ἐλθὲ ἐπ' ἡμαῖς | θυσίαις καὶ μοι τόδε πρᾶγμα | ποιήσον. (2870)

5 ἱπεύουσα, Pr 6 τρεσσαῖς, P 9 τεμεγερα, P 10
 ημερασ, P 11 σιειστε, P 14 καματωδιοισι, P 15 παλαμ-
 ναιησ, P 16 ταυρωπη, P 19 μορφαιλυκον, P 22 τετ-
 ραοδειτι, P 26 ἄκ(α)μάτων, Pr 27 τρισσων μεδεεις
 τρισσων δ' εκατων τε, P; also possible τρισσῶς μεδέεις τρισσῶν
 δεκάδων, Bortolani 33 φυσει παμμητωρ ου γαρ φοιτασεν,
 P 36 εξεω γαρ παντ' εστι | και εις αιωνε παντα τελευτα,
 P 39 κατεχαισ, P 40 ατοι, P; α[ὕ]τὸ[ς], Pr 46 εἰνο-
 διαιτε, P 48 δασπλαιτι, P 50 ολετισιδικη, P 54
 κοπετοκτυπε, P

Translation

- Come to me, O beloved mistress, Selene with three faces,
 with goodwill listen to my sacred charms,
 boast of the night, young, who give light to mortals, child of morn,
 who sit on wild bulls, queen,
 5 who ride in chariots on the same course of Helios,
 who dance with the triple forms of the triple Graces
 rejoicing in feast with the stars, you are Justice and the thread of the
 Moirai,
 Clotho and Lachesis and Atropos, three-headed,
 Persephone, Megaera and Alecto, with many forms,
 10 who equip your hands with black, dreadful lamps,
 who shake your hair of frightful snakes from your forehead,
 who raise bulls' bellow from your mouth,
 whose womb is covered with scales of reptiles,
 with poisonous interlacements of snakes coming down from your
 shoulders,
 15 you who are bound on your back by bloodthirsty chains,

HYMN TO HECATE-SELENE-PERSEPHONE-ARTEMIS

- who scream at night, with bull face, who love silence, bull-headed,
you have bull-looking eyes and the voice of a young dog,
you who hide your forms in lions' legs,
your ankle is wolf-looking, fierce-minded dogs are your friends;
20 therefore they call you Hecate, with many names, Mene,
who cleave air like Artemis shooter of arrows,
goddess with four faces, four names, goddess of the four roads,
Artemis, Persephone, deer-huntress, who shine in the night,
thrice-resounding, with three voices and three names, three-headed
Selene,
25 three-pointed, with three faces and three necks, goddess of crossroads,
you who, in triple baskets, hold the indefatigable fire of the flame
and protect the crossroads and rule the triple decades.
Be propitious to me as I am calling you, and listen benevolently,
you who, at night, wrap up the vast cosmos,
30 daimons shiver in fear of you and immortals tremble,
renowned goddess, with many names, who generate beautifully,
with bull face, horned, mother of gods and men,
and Nature mother of all; for you wander in Olympus,
and cross the wide, boundless abyss;
35 you are the beginning and the end, only you rule everything;
as everything originates from you and in you, eternal one, everything
reaches its end.
You wear on your temples as eternal band
the indestructible, indissoluble chains of the great Cronus
and you hold in your palms a golden sceptre.
40 Cronus himself engraved letters around your sceptre,
and gave it to you to carry, so that all things remain fixed:
subduer, subdued, subduer of men, constraint subduer.
You protect chaos ARARACHARARA ĒPHTHISIKĒRE.
Hail, goddess, listen to your names.
45 I offer you this spice in sacrifice, child of Zeus, shooter of arrows,
heavenly, goddess of the harbour, who wander through the
mountains, guardian of the roads,
infernal, nocturnal, of Hades, gloomy,
calm and horrible, who have your meal among the tombs,
Night, Erebus, vast Chaos: for you are inevitable Necessity,
50 you are Moira, you Erinyes, torture, you destroyer, you Justice.

You hold Cerberus in chains, you with scales of snakes;
 dark, with serpent like locks and girded by serpents,
 blood-drinker, death-bringer, born from destruction, you who have
 human hearts for your dinner,
 flesh-eater, who devour the ones who died untimely, who resound in
 the graves, who spread frenzy,
 55 come to my sacrifices and fulfil this matter for me.

COMMENTARY

1 δέσποινα: This epithet can be found in connection with various goddesses, among them also Hecate.³⁵⁹ Its pairing with εὐμενίη underlines that this initial passage praises Hecate in her traditional benevolent aspect.

τριπρόσωπε: See 10.3, 12.3–7.

2 Cf. 1.4, 22, 27, 2.17.

3 νυκτὸς ἀγαλμα: The same expression is used for the moon in the *OH* and Gregory of Nazianzus, and for the planet Venus in Bion.³⁶⁰

νέα: Possibly, like παρθένε (see 10.3), alluding to the ‘maiden status’ of the goddess. Otherwise, it could refer to the ‘new’ moon³⁶¹ as one of the possible aspects of the moon goddess.

φασείμβροτε: See 2.23A, but attested also for the moon and Hecate.³⁶²

ἠριγένεια: Homeric epithet of Eos³⁶³ apparently chosen thanks to the proximity of φασείμβροτος.³⁶⁴

³⁵⁹ Aesch. *TrGF* fr. 338; Athenaeus, 7.126.30 (=Chariclides, *PCG* fr. 1.1); see Kraus 1960, 86; *SEG* 30.326.

³⁶⁰ *OH* 9.9; Greg. Naz. *Carm. moral.* 526.14; Bion fr. 11.2 (Gow).

³⁶¹ LSJ, II. ³⁶² *Carm. de vir. GDRK* 64.129; Porph. *De philo.* 151.5.

³⁶³ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 1.477, 8.508, *Od.* 2.1, 3.491, 4.195, etc.; *HH* 5.226; Hes. *Th.* 381; Mimn. fr. 12.10 (West).

³⁶⁴ Cf. *HH* 4.184 (Richardson 2010, *ad loc.*): ἠὼς δ' ἠριγένεια φώως θνητοῖσι φέρουσα, ‘now Eos, morning’s daughter, who brings light to mortals’.

4 ἡ χαροποίς ταύροιςιν ἐφεζομένη: Considering that *χαροπός* (cf. 11.25–44, **B**), in its meaning of ‘fierce’, is never used for bulls but only for their horns, I prefer its meaning ‘bluish-grey’ which can be used to qualify the moon, the dawn and certain stars.³⁶⁵ Since the passage focuses on lunar attributes, the depiction of a sort of *Potnia Theron* would seem out of context, but the ‘bluish-grey bulls’ could refer to the lunar phases – the initial and final quarter (see 12.23).

βασίλεια: A rather generic epithet that can describe various goddesses and is frequent in the *OH*.³⁶⁶

5 Cf. 1.36–7, 7.14, 20–6. The moon is driving a horse-chariot as in the traditional Greek depiction.³⁶⁷

6–7 The moon goddess manifests herself in her three phases in the starry sky.

Χαρίτων τρισῶν: The triple Graces, Charites, were originally associated with Hecate especially in Attica, as testified by Hekataia showing on the pillar the three dancing maidens. On the Acropolis of Athens they probably shared with Hecate the function of protectress of the *limen* and were seen as attendants of the goddess.³⁶⁸

7–8 The identification of Hecate with Dike, mainly a bringer of vengeance, is not surprising given her assimilation with the deities of fate (Moirai, Tyche), with Ananke and with the

³⁶⁵ E.g. Apoll. Rhod. 1.1280; Plu. *De facie* 934c.12; Quintus, 10.337.

³⁶⁶ E.g. *HH* 12.2 (Hera); Pind. *Ol.* 14.3 (Charites); Emped. fr. 128.17 (Diels and Kranz) (Cypris); Aristoph. *Pax* 974 (Peace), *Ra.* 384 (Demeter); Theocr. 27.30 (Artemis); Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.1, 3.12 (Isis, see Vanderlip 1972, *ad loc.*; Bernand 1969, 631, no. 175, *ad loc.*); *OH* 1.5 (Hecate), 9.1 (Selene), 32.17 (Athena), 35.2 (Leto), 36.1 (Artemis).

³⁶⁷ E.g. *HH* 32.9–11.

³⁶⁸ Farnell 1896, II.552, 555–6; Kraus 1960, especially 71–2, 150–2; Werth 2006, 76–80; from the Hellenistic period onwards this type of Hekataion is found elsewhere but it might have gained popularity thanks to the increasing stress on the triple-apotropaic/triple-lunar nature of Hecate. For Hecate and the Charites on magical gems see Zwierlein-Diehl 2007, 217–18.

Erinyes, avengers of crimes committed by trespassers of Dike (see 10.1, 5, 14–16 κυρία, 17–18).³⁶⁹

τρικάρανε: Also at 24, see 10.3–5.

9 Περσεφώνη: See 10.4. Probably a mistake for ‘Tisiphone’, who, together with Magaira and Alecto, was one of the three Erinyes (see 10.5, 14–16 κυρία, 17–18).

πολύμορφε: See 14.9.

10 See 10.3–5, 11.58 λαμπάς, 90–94, 12.23 φασεσφόρε, 31 λαμπαδία, 32 δαδοῦχε.

11–14 See 10.5, 11.58 δράκαινα, cf. ἵππος.³⁷⁰

12 See 12.23.

15 Considering that the goddess is said to be Dike, the Moirai and the Erinyes, i.e. she is the one dispensing justice, she could hardly be described as ‘tied by bloodthirsty, avenging chains’. Therefore, the ‘avenging chains’ in question must be a metaphor for the snakes that come down from Hecate’s shoulders (line 14), ‘avenging’ as those of the avenging Erinyes.

16–17 ταυρώπι ... ταυροκάρηνε, ὄμμα δέ σοι ταυρωπόν:³⁷¹ see 12.23.

νυκτιβόη: See 10.3–5 νυχία, 12.8–9.

φιλήρεμε: In contrast with the previous, this epithet describes the goddess as the moon in the still of the night. Cf. φιλέρημος, ‘fond of solitude’, epithet of Hecate in *OH* 1.4.

17 ἔχεις σκυλακώδεα φωνήν: See 10.30.

18 See 11.59 λέων. The phrase seems to describe the iconography of Hecate-Artemis *Potnia Theron* standing between two lions.³⁷²

³⁶⁹ Cf. Nonn. *Dion.* 40.1–2 (Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad loc.*), pairing Dike with the threads of Moira; also used for Nature in *OH* 10.13. Graf, *NP* ‘Dike’; Shapiro, *LMC* ‘Dike’ (Hecate, Erinyes and Dike are often confused in iconography); Junge 1983, 82–3.

³⁷⁰ Compare other similar descriptions of Medusa, the Gorgons, the Erinyes: e.g. Hes. *Sc.* 233–4; Pind. *Pyth.* 10.46–8, 12.9; Aesch. *Pr.* 798–800; Ps.-Apollod. 2.40.3–4; Ovid., *Metam.* 4.481–511.

³⁷¹ For Hecate ταυρώπις (also at line 32) see Porph. *De philo.* 151.4; also Mene in Nonn. *Dion.* 11.185 (Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad loc.*), 44.217.

³⁷² Betz 1992, 91, footnote 349.

19 See **11.25–44, E**, λυκῶ, **10.30**, κύων.

20 πολυώνυμε: Also at **31**, see **14.23**.

Μήνην: See **11.24**.

21 Referring to the darts of Artemis ἰοχέαιρα (see **11.25–44, C**).

22 See **12.33**.

23–7 See **12.2–6**; for τριώνυμε see **10.3–5** τρικάρανε and **II** n.30.

27 The reading is based on the parallel in **12.6** καὶ τρίοδον μεθέπεις, ‘you who attend to the crossroads’. Since the papyrus has τρισσων μεδεεις τρισσων, it seems the copyist confused the second τρισσων with τρίοδον and wrote it twice, possibly because he understood the sentence as τρισσῶς μεδέεις, ‘you who protect thrice, in three ways, three times’.

28 Ἰλαθί μοι: See **1.32**.

εὐμενέως εἰσάκουσον: Cf. **1**. Again the lexical choice seems to underline that Hecate can have both a benevolent and a malignant aspect (Eumenides/Erinyes).

29 The phrase alludes to the orbit of the moon.

30 See **12.10–17**.

31 κυδιάνειρα: Used by Homer to qualify ‘battles’ in its active meaning ‘bringing men glory’, it is probably to be interpreted here in its later passive meaning ‘famous for men’, ‘renowned’.³⁷³ Interestingly, it appears as an epithet of Nature in the *OH* (see lines **32–6**).³⁷⁴

καλλιγένεια: Traditional epithet of Demeter, of her nurse, or of Gaea (see lines **32–6**).³⁷⁵

32 ταυρώπι, κερόεσσα: See **12.23**.

32–6 The main similarities between this passage and the earlier hymns to Aphrodite-Gaea-Nature have been discussed at **12.27–30**, but a few further comments are needed. First, we must note the parallelism between our passage (σὺ γὰρ φοιτᾷς ...) and the Euripidean one mentioned above

³⁷³ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 4.225, 6.124, 7.113; see LSJ.

³⁷⁴ *OH* 10.5.

³⁷⁵ Aristoph. *Th.* 299; Plu. *Aet. Rom.* 298b10–12; Alciph. 2.37.2.3; Nonn. *Dion.* 6.140 (Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad loc.*); Hesych. K 472; Phot. K 118.

(*Hipp.* 447–8, φοιτᾷ δ' ἄν' αἰθέρ', ἔστι δ' ἐν θαλασσίῳ κλύδωνι Κύπρις, πάντα δ' ἐκ ταύτης ἔφου): Aphrodite wanders in the Olympos/sky and crosses/is in the wide abyss/wave of the sea – and everything stems from her. Second, Hecate is 'the beginning and the end . . . as everything originates from you and in you, eternal one, everything reaches its end'. We saw at 2.4 that these expressions applied to male deities could contain some Stoic or Orphic echoes, and that ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος referring to God is often found in Christian literature. However, from a philosophical point of view, what Heraclitus said about fire, Xenophanes said about earth, in a maxim equally quoted by many authors: ἐκ γαίης γὰρ τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς γῆν πάντα τελευτᾷ.³⁷⁶ In the common sensibility, the idea of Earth as the producer and 'final destination' of everything easily develops from the observation of the vegetative cycle and was favoured by the Greeks who imagined their Underworld underground.³⁷⁷ The *Homeric Hymn* to Gaea says 'giving life to mortal men or taking it away is up to you', and in Aeschylus the earth τὰ πάντα τίκτεται, θρέψασά τ' αὔθις τῶνδε κῦμα λαμβάνει, 'gives birth to all things, and having nurtured them receives their increase in turn'.³⁷⁸ The *OH* call Gaea πανδώτειρα, παντολέτειρα, 'who gives everything, who everything destroys', while Nature is Φύσι παμμήτειρα θεά . . . αὐξίτροφος πείρα πεπαινομένων τε λύτειρα 'Nature, goddess mother of all . . . fertile promoter of growth, dissolver of what has ripened'.³⁷⁹

In conclusion, when these epithets apply to a male solar god they either express a general 'eternity' or 'extended dominion' of the deity, or require a specific theological/philosophical background to be justified – mainly Egyptian, Stoic or

³⁷⁶ Xenoph. fr. 27 (Diels and Kranz).

³⁷⁷ Similarly in LXX, *Ge.* 3.19: 'until you return to the earth from which you were taken' ὅτι γῇ εἶ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ, 'since you are earth and to earth you shall return' (referring to God's creation of Adam from earth, but implying the same idea).

³⁷⁸ *HH* 30.6–7; Aesch. *Ch.* 127–8.

³⁷⁹ *OH* 26.2, 10.1, 17.

Christian. On the contrary, when they are used for female chthonic goddesses they find a more linear explanation in the dynamics of the vegetative cycle. Our passage does not mention Aphrodite, but θεῶν γενέτειρα καὶ ἀνδρῶν ... Φύσι παμμήτωρ ... σὺ δὲ πάντα τελεῖς appears in the spell immediately following the one in question within a hexametrical hymn to Aphrodite (IV 2916–20), testifying that the idea of ‘love’ as the triggering power behind generation is still present in the *PGM*. Interestingly, the collocation θεῶν γενέτειρα καὶ ἀνδρῶν appears only in the *PGM* and in the *OH* 3.1 for Nyx as primeval goddess.³⁸⁰

On the other hand, ‘you are the beginning and the end for mortals’, μερόπων ἀρχὰ καὶ τέρμα, and ‘all things’ beginning and conclusion you ever hold’, πάντων γὰρ ἀρχὰν καὶ τέλος αἰὲν ἔχεις, are found also in two hymns to Tyche, one preserved by Stobaios, the other on a papyrus of the third century AD (but the hymn it contains may be Hellenistic).³⁸¹ In the first case, the sentence is used specifically to refer to human fate (μερόπων, ‘for mortals’), while in the second, the meaning could be extended to include the whole cosmos unless we understand πάντων as masculine, ‘you hold everybody’s beginning and end’. Whatever the case, both sentences express the absolute power of Chance/Fate and suggest that the same idea could underlie the similar description of Hecate in our hymn, which could have thus been triggered also by her association with the deities of fate (see 10.14–16, κυρία).

πάντων δὲ σὺ μούνη ἀνάσσεις: Cf. πάντα κρατύνεις or παντοκράτωρ, see 9.6, 3.21. In Euripides, Aphrodite-love rules over all living creatures as the driving force behind generation (συμπάντων βασιλῆῖδα τιμάν, Κύπρι, τῶνδε μόνα κρατύνεις, ‘over all these, Aphrodite, you alone hold your honoured sway’), and Demeter is πάντων ἄνασσα, ‘ruler of

³⁸⁰ On the identification of Nyx-Aphrodite in *OH*, Rudhardt 2008, 189.

³⁸¹ I.16.13 (*PMG* 1019); P. Berlin 9734; for both see Furley 2010, 166–77 with commentary.

all'.³⁸² Similar expressions are very frequent in the *OH*: as Hecate is 'heavenly, chthonic and marine', she is the 'key-holder mistress of all the cosmos' (see 10.4, κλειδοῦχε),³⁸³ Hera rules everything and is the mistress of everything (πάντων γὰρ κρατέεις μούνη πάντεσσι τ' ἀνάσσεις) as queen of the gods, and she is also παμβασίλεια, 'queen of everything'.³⁸⁴ The same epithet is attributed to Rea, Artemis and Nature, who is also παντοκράτειρα like Persephone.³⁸⁵ Not surprisingly, in Isidorus' *Hymn* 1.1–2 Isis is ἀνασσα, παντοκράτειρα, and similar expressions are often used for the 'all-including' Hellenistic goddess.

37–41 The crown and sceptre are generally symbols of dominion and frequently appear in the iconography of Demeter.³⁸⁶ At the same time, in Homer, the δεσμούς ἀρρήκτους, ἀλύτους (*Od.* 8.274–5) are those that Hephaestus forged to tie Ares and Aphrodite in their bed of love, and in Hesiod (*Th.* 718) the defeated Titans – including Cronus – are bound in 'painful chains'. However, already Plato (*Cra.* 404a.5–6) talks metaphorically of 'Cronus' chains', as something that the god can impose on others as a means of constraining, and in the *OH* (13.4) Cronus has 'δεσμούς ἀρρήκτους in the infinite cosmos' as Time keeps everything together (Cronus-Chronus, see 11.68–73). Here, Hecate wears them as a crown, thus she controls their power, which seems to imply her dominion over constraint, i.e. her identification with Ananke – and the other deities of fate (see 10.14–16, κυρία).³⁸⁷ At the same time, the chains in question belong to Cronus-time (cf. 11.68–73). Somehow the connection with time is inherent in the concept of Necessity, as everything that has to happen necessarily, necessarily happens at a certain time, but Ananke and Chronus are especially associated in Orphic cosmogonies where they appear

³⁸² Eur. *Hipp.* 1280–1, *Ph.* 685–6. ³⁸³ *OH* 1.2, 7.

³⁸⁴ *OH* 16.2, 7, 9. ³⁸⁵ *OH* 14.7, 36.11, 10.4, 16, 29.10.

³⁸⁶ Beschi, *LIMC* 'Demeter', B.b, G, etc.

³⁸⁷ The tradition of Prometheus wearing a crown as a symbolic punishment does not seem to be at work here, cf. Aesch. fr. 235 (Radt).

as a couple of primeval cosmic gods.³⁸⁸ The sceptre engraved by Cronus-Chronus seems to allude to the same idea of Hecate-Ananke's pairing with the god as cosmic rulers over Time and Necessity.

42 The verse utilizes 'magical repetition' so to almost transform the line in a *vox magica* (see 6.2–3 and I n.433). All the epithets fit the Hecate-Ananke identification of the previous lines (cf. 14.7 πανδαμάτειρα).³⁸⁹

43 σὺ δὲ χάους μεδέεις: Again, probably the 'infinite darkness' as a region of the Underworld, see 1.20–1.

αραραχααρα: Palindrome: cf. 7.31.³⁹⁰

45 See 12.1.

46–7 See 12.35–6.

νυχία: See 10.3.

Αἰδωναία: See 14.9

48 See 12.19.

δασπλῆτι: Traditional epithet of Erinys,³⁹¹ used also for Hecate and other monstrous creatures.³⁹²

τάφοις ἐνι δαῖτα ἔχουσα: The phrase may echo the 'suppers' offered to Hecate at crossroads (see 10.2, 3–5, and II n.21).

49 Νύξ, Ἐρεβος, Χάος εὐρύ: Nyx, Erebus and Chaos appear together with Tartarus as the first primeval principles in one of the Orphic cosmogonies.³⁹³ However, an Orphic echo is not strictly necessary, since in the Hesiodic *Theogony* Chaos was

³⁸⁸ West 1983, especially 190–8; Brisson 1995, 42–3; Also e.g. *Corp.Herm.* fr. 23.28.6–7 (Cronus father of Dike and Ananke); Vett. Val. 1.1.129 (Cronus-Saturn 'lord of Necessity').

³⁸⁹ Cf. Hom. *Il.* 14.259 (Nyx is δμήτειρα θεῶν καὶ ἀνδρῶν, 'subduer of gods and men', cf. line 49); Nonn. *Dion.* 35.277, 16.221 (Vian et al. 1976–2006, *ad loc.*) and 30.132 (Tyche and Moira are πανδαμάτειρα, 'all-subduer').

³⁹⁰ Cf. I n.144.

³⁹¹ Hom. *Od.* 15.234; Hes. fr. 280.9 (Merkelbach and West); Euphorion, fr. 94.1 (Powell) (Eumenides); Orph. *Arg.* 869; Suda, Δ 85.

³⁹² Theocr. 2.14; Simonid. *PMG* fr. 17.1.1 (Kharybdis); Nicand. *Th.* 609 (dragon).

³⁹³ Aristoph. *Av.* 693–4 (Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 64).

already the first principle – followed by Gaea, Tartarus and Eros – and Erebus and Nyx were said to be born from Chaos (cf. 1.20–1).³⁹⁴ Whatever the background, the reason why Hecate is identified with these entities seems to lie in their ‘dark’, chthonian connotation and on their kinship with Ananke, the Moirai and the Erinyes.³⁹⁵

49–50 See 10.1, 5, 14–16 κυρία, 17–18.

βάσανος, ὀλέτις: Possibly to be considered as appositions to Erinys, as the two nouns fit the role of punisher-avenger of crimes.³⁹⁶ In the *OH* παντολέτειρα, ‘all-destroyer’, is an epithet of Gaea (see lines 32–6).³⁹⁷

Δίκη: See line 7.

51 See 11.17–21, cf. 10.30 κύων μέλαινα. Hecate controls the doorkeeper of the Underworld, not only as infernal goddess but also as mediating κλειδοῦχος (see 10.4).

φολίσιν σὺν δρακόντων: See lines 11–14.

52 κυανέα: In Hesiod (*Sc.* 249) the Keres, the daimons of cruel death, are said to be ‘dark’ in the sense of ‘baleful’, as bringers of death. Moreover, the appearance of κυάνεος within a description of Hecate’s serpentine traits suggests that the choice of the term could have been influenced by its appearance in earlier literature as an adjective referring to the colour of snakes – in its meaning ‘dark blue’, ‘cyan blue’.³⁹⁸

ὄφιοπλόκαμε καὶ ζωνοδράκοντι: See lines 11–14. The first term – in the form ὄφιοπλόκαμος – is attested in three instances to describe the Erinyes,³⁹⁹ while the second is a *hapax*.

³⁹⁴ Hes. *Th.* 116–23.

³⁹⁵ E.g. the Moirai are daughters of Nyx (Hes. *Th.* 217), of Nyx and Erebus (Cicero, *De nat. deo.* 3.17), of Chaos (Quintus, 3.756–7); Ananke (=Chronus) is the mother of Chaos and Erebus (Bernabé 2004–7, fr. 77, 78); the Erinyes are the daughters of Nyx (Aesch. *Eu.* 321–2).

³⁹⁶ Cf. *AP* 11.24.2: ὀλέτειραι Ἐρινύες. ³⁹⁷ *OH* 26.2.

³⁹⁸ E.g. Hom. *Il.* 11.26, 39 (snakes made of enamel); Hes. *Sc.* 167; Theocr. 24.14.

³⁹⁹ Cornut. 11.13; *OH* 69.16 (Erinyes assimilated with the Moirai), 70.10 (Eumenides).

CONCLUSIONS

53-4 This series of epithets – mainly *hapax legomena* – describes the goddess in her darker, fierce and monstrous aspect as a devourer of men, using a language more appropriate for the animals with which Hecate is identified than for the deity herself (e.g. αἱμοπότι⁴⁰⁰, σαρκοφάγε⁴⁰¹). The passage especially recalls Mormo, Lamia and the flesh-eater vampire Empousa (see **13.14-18**), three ghosts/demons in the train of Hecate. Mormo (cf. **11.25-44**, **E**, λυκώ, **14.30**) and Lamia were thought to kidnap and kill children (cf. line 54 ἄωρο-βόρε)⁴⁰² and seem to have emerged from those malevolent ghosts of prematurely dead women mentioned above (see **10.3-5**).

οἰστροπλάνεια: The term seems to refer to erotic frenzy.

55 Cf. **12.37**.

CONCLUSIONS

The hymn is mainly constituted by long strings of epithets – or one-line participial phrases serving as epithets – among them some direct addresses to the goddess (lines 1-2, 28, 44, 55), and further narrative sections (lines 6-8, 20, 33-41) are interspersed. Apart from lines 45 and 55, there are no precise references to the ritual, but the numerous parallels in **12** still suggest that the extant hymn was composed by gathering various sources (see **12** Conclusions).

As far as the nature of the deity is concerned, the situation is very similar to **12**: even if the goddess seems to be identified with Hathor-Isis, all the attributes can fit Hecate-Selene too

⁴⁰⁰ E.g. Aristophanes Gramm. *Aristoph. hist.* 2.212-13 (with σαρκοφάγος), 2.337 (wolf); Aristoph. *Eq.* 198, 208 (dragon).

⁴⁰¹ E.g. Aristot. *HA* 594a12 (snakes), 594b17 (lion); Aelian, *NA* 17.31.25-6 (lions and wolves).

⁴⁰² E.g. Heraclit. *Incred.* 34; Duris, *FGrH* fr. 17; Philostr. *Vit. Apol.* 4.25; Phot. *A* 61; Suda, *M* 1252; *Scholia in Ael. Arist. Pan* 102.5; Johnston 1995b; Johnston 1999, 161-83.

(see **12** Conclusions). This hymn does not mention Aphrodite, but her presence is implied in 32–6, a passage which, compared with **12.27–30**, stresses Aphrodite's identification with Gaea-Nature even more. In spite of the possible influence of Hathor-Isis, the idea of the earth as mother, 'beginning and end' of everything, is traditionally Greek and could appear here because of Hecate's chthonic traits. At the same time, the other possibly Hathorian epithets (lines 16–17 **ταυρῶπι** ..., 22, 32 **ταυρῶπι** ...) can also be explained thanks to Hecate's lunar nature and the addition of Aphrodite as fourth phase of the moon (see **12** Conclusions).

CONCLUSIONS

DEITIES IN CONTEXT: AIMS OF THE MAGICAL PROCEDURES

In order to reach a better understanding of the nature of divinity in magical hymns it is worthwhile to consider the magical context in which these compositions are employed. According to the male deity–female lunar/chthonic deity subdivision, two main trends can be distinguished. In most spells involving hymns to the male deity the main goal is to obtain a prophecy (**1**,¹ **2C**, **3**, **5**, **6**, **7**, **8**), whether through a dream oracle, lamp divination or necromancy. The remaining spells have various purposes: to attract love (**2A**), acquire a spirit as assistant (**2B**), make the god do ‘whatever you want’ (**4**, possibly implying also prophecy), consecrate a magical ring (**9**). On the other hand, attracting love is the main aim of most spells involving lunar/chthonic hymns (**10**, **12**, **13A–B**, **14**), which in two cases (**12**, **13A–B**) also have secondary goals, i.e. cursing (causing misfortune/sickness/death) and sending/having revelatory dreams. Cursing is also the only purpose for which **11** is employed, and is likely to be one of the two aims of **15**. As pieces of formulae powerful in themselves, the hymns could be added to different magical procedures, but, despite a few exceptions, the extant instances indicate that male and female hymns were normally preferred for oracle and love/curse spells respectively. The question is: did male solar/creator gods (plus Apollo) have a special association with prophecy in both Greek and Egyptian traditions? And what about lunar/chthonic goddesses and attracting love/cursing?

¹ Though this spell aims mainly at obtaining information about magical knowledge, this knowledge especially involves oracular procedures, and the magician can also ask the god about ‘whatever he wishes’: the essential goal is again oracular.

CONCLUSIONS

In Graeco-Roman Egypt oracular practice was very popular and employed different methods: some of them were deeply rooted in Egyptian tradition and belonged to the official rituals performed by the temples (e.g. the processional oracle, cf. **I** n.410), while others can be considered as Hellenistic developments and were probably the competence of ritual experts (e.g. *Homeromanteia*, *Sortes Astrampsychi*, horoscopes).² Despite this subdivision, Hellenistic influences can be detected even in traditional temple oracles: from the introduction of new techniques³ to the appearance of Greek deities (or Greek equivalent deities) invested with prophetic functions as for example the variety of addressees in the corpus of oracular questions from the Fayum testifies.⁴ We can find for example Isis, Harpocrates, Sobek (and his local forms), Thooris, Amun, Zeus, the Dioscuri, up to the Christian God and saints, and throughout Egypt oracles could be delivered by for example Isis, Sarapis and Bes.⁵ This wide range of addressees does not mean that traditionally all deities were necessarily endowed with prophetic power. In Greece, Apollo was the god of

² On this and the following Černý 1962; Frankfurter 1998, 145–97; Clarysse 2009, 571–2, 579–80; Dieleman 2012, 345–6; Naether 2010, especially 12–61 for a detailed overview.

³ Whether some new techniques had a Greek or an Egyptian origin is still under debate even if an external influence is hard to deny for practices such as incubation (and also necromancy, see **I** n.129, though probably not in direct connection with the temple institution): see e.g. von Lieven 1999, 95–7, 99–105, 108–14; Ogden 2001; Rimer 2002; Baines 1991, 152–5; Sauneron 1959, 48–50; Bresciani 2005, especially 27–37, 47–55, cf. 103–41; cf. Hopfner 1974–90, II.1.259–60. As far as the origin of incubation is concerned, J. F. Quack is working on the edition of a Saitic-period manual (P. Heidelberg Dem. 5, see **Intro.** n.56), aiming at obtaining possible dream oracles about healing methods from Imhotep, which will open new perspectives on the subject.

⁴ Kákosy, *LdÄ* ‘Orakel’, 600–6; Valbelle and Husson 1998; cf. Chosson 2004, especially 94–127; Buchholz 2013; for this and a comparison between this corpus and other forms of divination see Naether 2010, 359–410. Though, not surprisingly, Demotic oracle questions prefer the national pantheon: see Zauzich 2000 (cf. **Intro.** p. 7).

⁵ Detailed discussion in Frankfurter 1998, especially 161–79; Naether 2010, 415–17; Dunand 1997; cf. Quaegebeur 1977.

prophecy *par excellence* (see 1.2), and, even if there are some doubts about his original solar traits, he was equated with Helios as early as the fifth century BC (see 1.7–9), and his oracle at Delphi remained active till the fourth century AD.⁶ On the other hand, the first attestation of oracular practice clearly involving a deity in Egypt dates to the XVIII Dynasty (c. 1550–1298 BC) and involves Hatshepsut and Thutmose III consulting the oracle of Amun at Karnak. The popularity of this oracle was great till the Late period, and continued with the oracle of the same god in the oasis of Siwa.⁷ Even if Amun was not originally a god of prophecy, his pre-eminence in this function seems to derive from the primordial connotations he already had as a member of the Hermopolitan Ogdoad, and the solar-creative traits he acquired in the New Kingdom contributed to stressing this ‘primeval omniscience’.⁸ Therefore, in both Greek and Egyptian traditions, a connection between solar gods – though of course not exclusively – and prophecy is attested,⁹ with the difference that in Egypt the oracular god *par excellence* was also a primordial creator. The same cannot be said for female lunar/chthonic deities and attracting love/cursing.

In Greece, execrating involved chthonic gods from the archaic period. In the *Iliad* curses are sworn invoking chthonic Zeus, Persephone and the Erinyes, and later the most common form of magical cursing, the *defixiones*, appeal to the same or other chthonic deities (e.g. Persephone, Demeter, Gaia,

⁶ Parke and Wormell 1956, 283–91.

⁷ Altenmüller, *LdÄ* ‘Amunsbarke’, 248–51; *RÄRG*, ‘Orakel’, 560–4; Blackman 1925 and 1926; Kákósy 1981, 139–40; von Lieven 1999, 79–95; Traunecker 1997, 35–44; Kruchten 1997; cf. I n.410, **Concl.** n.2; Kuhlmann 1988; cf. Römer 2003. There are a few earlier attestations of oracular practice in Egypt, but they involve techniques in which the intervention of a deity, if ever implied, is not explicit: see again von Lieven 1999, 97, 106–9, 116–17.

⁸ Kákósy 1981.

⁹ Contrary to Cox Miller 1994, 120, who discusses mainly the dream oracles of the *PGM*.

CONCLUSIONS

Hermes), among them Hecate.¹⁰ In Egypt, it is mainly from the New Kingdom onwards that deities start to be involved in cursing.¹¹ Many gods can be invoked – for example, Amun-Re, Mut, Sekhmet, Osiris, Isis, Horus – but they do not seem to have any special characteristic in common. The underlying idea could be that, while in the Greek conception the ideal ultimate curse is death – hence the constant involvement of chthonic deities – in the Egyptian it is not death itself, but the ‘second death’,¹² the impossibility of being reborn as a transfigured being. This process of rebirth was the funerary counterpart of the cosmic daily regeneration of the sun: to be able to rise again the sun god had to fight every night against his sworn enemy, the serpent Apophis (see 1.35), who endangered the maintenance of the cosmic order. His annihilation was not achieved by the sun god alone, but with the help of all his entourage. Thanks to this dualistic conception (order/chaos, sun god/Apophis), the ultimate execration was the execration of Apophis, and any personal enemy could be equated with Apophis. Similarly, the other menace to the cosmic order, Seth – who killed Osiris and dismembered his body – was defeated by a solar god, Horus, and became the other paradigmatic object of execrations. This mythological background explains why the deities invoked in curses do not all belong to the same category: any god could be involved in the execration of the ‘cosmic’ enemies, especially solar gods.¹³

¹⁰ For these execrations written on lead tablets and attested from the sixth/fifth century BC onwards, Audollent 1904; Watson 1991, especially 194–8. Cf. Versnel 1998.

¹¹ Morschauser 1991; Assmann 1992, 155–7.

¹² See I n.137. Of course curses often limit themselves to more mundane misfortunes, but the psychological predisposition of a person wishing somebody ill automatically creates the question ‘What is the worst thing that could happen to him?’

¹³ For the magical cursing of Apophis see e.g. Sander-Hansen 1956, 16–17; Faulkner 1937b. At the same time, the same enemies could become the executors of the curse, as happens for example from the end of the New Kingdom in the common malediction ‘you/your wife will be raped by a

In magical practice, the situation is slightly different: both Greek *defixiones* and Egyptian execration figurines were often buried near the graves of the dead since in both cultures many worldly adversities were thought to be caused by them.¹⁴ However, whenever deities are involved, Greek curses are consistent in appealing to chthonic gods, while the Egyptian addressees are much more varied and are frequently solar deities. One could object that in Egyptian religion a female chthonic/lunar deity did not exist since both chthonic (e.g. Osiris, Anubis) and lunar (e.g. Thoth, Khonsu) competences were more often reserved to male gods. However, apart from gender, we could have still found a relevant correspondence between cursing and chthonic/lunar deities in Egypt if the majority of execrations had involved e.g. Osiris or Thoth,¹⁵ but this is not the case. We must conclude that the invocation of chthonic/lunar goddesses in a malediction context shows continuity with Greek tradition only. The same can be said for chthonic/lunar goddesses and the kind of erotic magic found in our spells.

In Greece the tutelary goddess of love magic seems to have originally been Aphrodite, while the involvement of Hecate started only in the Hellenistic period; but, if we consider the affinity between curses and erotic spells (see 10.22–8), Hecate's late pre-eminence in love magic seems to have derived from her earlier role in the *defixiones*.¹⁶ On the other

donkey', where the donkey is one of Seth's animal symbols. See also Quack 2010b, especially 36–45.

¹⁴ See 10.2; Brashear 1995, 3445; Ritner 1993, 172–83; Johnston 1999, 90–4; Gager 1992, 15, 18–20.

¹⁵ The latter also plays an important role in the Underworld especially in the judgment of the deceased: Bleeker 1973, 145–9; Seeber 1976, especially 147–54; cf. Stadler 2009b, 128–34, 430–9.

¹⁶ Faraone 1999, 22, footnote 97, 133–46: there are also very few attestations alluding to an early connection between love magic and Selene; should they prove themselves to be well grounded, the identification Hecate-Selene could have promoted the predominance of Hecate in the field. Johnston 1999, 71–80; also Gager 1992.

CONCLUSIONS

hand, only one certain example of a love spell survives from Pharaonic Egypt:¹⁷ not only does it invoke the solar Re-Horakhty, the Seven Hathors (deities who presided over the birth of children as seven fates) and the ‘gods of heaven and earth’, but, most of all, it does not follow a curse pattern. The gods are asked to make the beloved come to the petitioner ‘like an ox after grass, like a servant (possibly to be emended “mother”) after her children, like a drover after his herd’. All the similes describe actions inherent in the natural order of things: the ox will necessarily go after grass since it needs it for its nourishment;¹⁸ the servant/mother and the drover will necessarily go after the children and the herd respectively since it is their role and duty to do so. No torture or affliction is inflicted on the beloved, but the magical formula tries to affect reality by describing the craved-for required love as something that must exist necessarily, as part of the natural order.

In conclusion, while prophecy and solar gods can find an earlier connection in both Greek and Egyptian religious thought, the association of erotic magic/cursing with chthonic/lunar goddesses is previously attested only in Greek tradition. It should also be noted that the aims of the spells containing a hymn to the chthonic/lunar goddess are almost always the standard ones – the only exception being **15** ‘for doing good or harm’ – while in the spells containing a hymn to the male god they are more varied. Even when ‘sending/having revelatory dreams’ appears among the goals of a chthonic/lunar spell (**12–13A**, **13B**), it is always a secondary aim, and thus it could have easily been added at a later stage since, as Hecate could send a demon to torment the

¹⁷ Smither 1941. There are also two dubious cases: see Quack 2012b, 911–12, 915; cf. Quack 2011d, 71; Quack 2010b, especially 51–7 also for the connection between love magic in the *PGM* and earlier Egyptian execration rituals; cf. Posener 1986.

¹⁸ For the persistence of animal similes in Coptic magic see Frankfurter 2001.

victim of a love spell, she could be connected with revelatory dreams through necromancy.¹⁹ In theory, we could have found Hecate as the protagonist of a spell whose main purpose was necromancy, but such an instance is not attested. All this suggests that female hymns were used less freely than male ones, and perceived as closer to a special context.

A final remark can be added on the attestations of the divine names 'Hecate' and 'Apollo' in the whole *PGM* corpus. If we do not take into consideration our hymns and the spells containing them, we will find that while for example Helios' name appears about another eighty times, the attestations of Apollo and Hecate's names are very scant. The former appears eleven times, three of them within a quoted Homeric verse (VII 45, 138, XXa 3), and four in the description of a figurine of the god but not directly connected with the invocation (XIII 103, 105, 660, 662); this reduces the actual attestations to four (III 298, VII 727, 735, X 36), three of which come from two spells with oracular purpose.²⁰ Similarly, Hecate's name appears eight times, one of which is in the description of a figurine of the goddess but not directly connected with the invocation (IV 2119); this reduces the attestations to seven (IV 2957, XXXVI 190, LXX 5, *Suppl.* 49-40, 69, 54.14, 100.6), six of which are within erotic spells in the usual Greek pattern. Finally, it must not be forgotten that all Hecate's hymns are preserved in only one papyrus, *PGM* IV.²¹ All this suggests that these two deities were especially linked to one kind of procedure and not so popular in the *PGM*

¹⁹ Moreover, 'sending dreams' is often connected with aggressive/love magic; see Quack 2010b, 36-45 (cf. Quack 2011c); Johnston 2010a, 413-14; Johnston 2010b, 63-9.

²⁰ The fourth spell is a 'charm to subject' where, given the Egyptian nature of the procedure employed, the name Apollo seems to have been used to replace the Egyptian solar god. Similarly Phoibos is attested only once (III 290) outside the spells containing the hymns, and Paian is never attested.

²¹ They seem to have been all copied from a single pre-existent source: LiDonnici 2003, 171-2.

CONCLUSIONS

milieu, which is particularly surprising in view of the fame of Apollo as prophet and of Hecate as magician. The scarcity of attestations and readaptation to new magical procedures may imply that the compilers of the extant *PGM* had an Egyptian background and were not sufficiently acquainted with these deities to feel free to modify their original procedural context – which they clearly did e.g. in 2A where a deity with the attributes of the Egyptian solar god is invoked in an erotic spell following the Greek standard pattern.

LANGUAGE, STRUCTURE AND STYLE IN RELATION TO CONTENTS

Generally speaking, the stylistic and structural analysis proceeds from the remarks made in ‘Egyptian and Greek hymnography: a brief comparison’. When talking about style, since my primary aim is to understand the nature of divinity expressed by magical hymns, I mainly consider ‘praising sections’ (all the passages that tell us something about the deity’s attributes and competences regardless of their structural position) while I exclude sections involving subjects other than the deity invoked²² and ‘ritual sections’ (descriptions of magical ritual).²³ The ‘praising sections’ can be subdivided into two components: syntactically developed passages (whether

²² E.g. 3.1–8 (exhorting the cosmos to keep silence), 29–31 (describing the cosmic awe); 4.7–9 (describing the activities of the astral bodies); 9.7–10; 12.10–17 (both describing the cosmic awe). In these passages, the involvement of the deity is marginal; they are important as far as content is concerned, but cannot be considered as direct descriptions. On the contrary, 7.20–6 will be taken into account since it depicts not only the reactions of other entities (Dawn, Sunset and Night), but also the divine activities causing these reactions (the god moves through the sky, ‘passes the axis of the universe’, cracks the whip).

²³ They provide information about the deity’s competence in a specific magical procedure: topic discussed in the previous chapter.

constituted by participial, relative or verbal phrases) and enumerative passages (strings of juxtaposed epithets).

On the contrary, when talking about structure, different passages are distinguished according to the different functions they perform in the hymn, no matter what kind of style they employ or if they provide information about the deity's attributes and competences (e.g. ritual sections are taken into consideration). Standard structural subdivisions (*epiclēsis*, *eulogia*, *euchē*) are often ambiguous when applied to magical hymns, hence they will not be given much relevance. As seen in the Introduction, a lexical or stylistic choice cannot be considered sufficient for determining which cultural background underlies it. Therefore, the expressive patterns examined will always be analysed together with the contents they convey.

Homeric language

Both categories of hymns occasionally employ Homeric language, whether using single words²⁴ or longer phrases. The only exceptions are **6**, **7** and **8** where the Homeric vocabulary becomes more frequent²⁵ and in **8**.21–2, 27–9 five Iliadic verses are pasted into the hymn. This large employment of traditional language fits the general intent of these compositions: to invoke Apollo – or Apollo-Helios, **7** – with his traditional attributes (see Conclusions to **6**, **7**, **8**). Even when the terms are given a new significance (for example, they were applied to other deities in Homer or were not divine epithets at all) the general

²⁴ I consider especially the imperatives directly addressing the god and the terms used as divine epithets excluding the too-generic ones (e.g. ἄναξ).

²⁵ E.g. **6**.1 Φοῖβε, ἐπίρροθος, ἔρχεο, 2 ἐκάεργε, ἄγε δεῦρο, 3 μαντεύεο, νυκτὸς ἐν ὥρῃ, 6 εἴ ποτε δῆ; **7**.3 σκηπτούχος, Παιάν, 5 ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν, 6 ἀμβροσίων, 8 κλύθι, 14 κλυτόπωλε, γαιήοχον, 15–18 διυπετές, αἰγλήεις, ἀκίχητε, παλαιγενές, αἰολοθώρηξ, ἀκάμας, χρυσήνιε, line 19, 20–2 ὄρθρον, μετόπισθε, possibly 35 ἀεροειδῆ in its form ἡεροειδής; **8**.2 Φοῖβος, line 13, obviously 21–2 and 27–9, 34 ἔρχεο θᾶσσον.

CONCLUSIONS

impression is that the nature of the deity invoked somehow entitled the authors to draw inspiration from that specific cultural background, otherwise it would be hard to explain why Homeric language is much rarer in the hymns describing a different conception of divinity.

In fact, apart from **6**, **7** and **8** (from now on called Apollonian hymns), the remaining hymns to the male deity²⁶ (from now on called solar hymns) very rarely employ Homeric vocabulary to describe the nature of the deity invoked, but they use it mainly in pattern expressions, especially within direct addresses to the god.²⁷ The Homeric insertions look more like a stylistic touch triggered by the hexameter than intentional references to a cultural background. An exception would seem to be **5**, where the Homeric line (2) describes the god. However, the incompatibility between Proteus and the deity depicted by the rest of the composition, together with the striking Egyptian character of this hymn, makes clear that the author did not know much about the Homeric Proteus. It seems he just saw some similarities between the deity he was praising, who was capable of ‘manifesting himself’ in various shapes, and the description of Proteus ‘transforming himself’ into various shapes, and thus decided to add the line as the two gods were comparable from his point of view. The verse seems to suggest to the reader an *interpretatio graeca* of this otherwise very Egyptian hymn, and thus to have been added for the sake of a Hellenized ‘audience’, but a Greek reader of the whole hymn would have had much difficulty in recognizing the deity as Proteus. Even in this case, the use of Homer does not imply a real acquaintance with his cultural background, but only the will to give the hymn a ‘Greek touch’.

²⁶ Apart from **4**, which does not contain any specifically Homeric expression.

²⁷ E.g. **1.8** ἵλαος ἔλθοις (Homeric ἵλαος ἔστω), **19** κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν, **20** κλυθί; **2.2** ἀκάματον πῦρ, **7** κλυθί; **3.9**, **16** ἵλαος ἔσσο; **9.8** ποταμῶν τε ῥέεθρα.

Sometimes, Homeric expressions directly describing the god can fit both their original and new contexts so as to give the impression that the Greek religious background has been understood and adapted with consistency.²⁸ However, these instances are very scant and almost all of them involve divine aspects that were already present in Egyptian solar gods. In conclusion, the use of Homeric language in the solar hymns²⁹ almost never conveys exclusively Greek divine features,³⁰ which, on the contrary, may happen in the Apollonian hymns.³¹ Clearly both groups used Homeric sources, but in different ways: in one case mainly as a stylistic contrivance, in the other also as a means to convey the religious imagery typical of Greek tradition.

In the chthonic/lunar hymns (from now on called simply lunar hymns), as in the Apollonian, we find, apart from sections of verses pasted into the hymns,³² Homeric language employed both in direct addresses to the deity³³ and in epithets describing the nature of the goddess.³⁴ Again, the epithets have often been adapted to the new context since it is possible to find terms that Homer applied to other deities or did not use as divine epithets at all. However, even in this case they are often comprehensible

²⁸ See 1.1 Παίηονι; 2.23Α φαεσίμβροτε; 3.11 (possibly modelled on the *HH* to Demeter), 24 (possibly a Homeric echo).

²⁹ Very restricted in 5 and 9.

³⁰ The only exception being 1.1 Παίηονι.

³¹ E.g. see 6.1 Φοῖβε, 2 ἐκάεργε (Apollo far-darter); 7.3 Παῖάν, 14 κλυτό-πῳλε, 15–18 αἰολοθώρηξ, χρυσήνιε (Apollo riding a chariot and wearing a breastplate); 8.2 Φοῖβος, 21–2, 27–9 (Apollo's classical toponyms and epithets).

³² E.g. 12.5 ἀκάματον πῦρ, 15 ἀτρύγετός τε θάλασσα; 14.14 ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸν ἔχοντες, 22 φιλότῃτι καὶ εὐνῇ, 33 ἡδὲ γυναικῶν; 15.36 πάντα τελευτᾷ, 38, 39 χρύσειον σκῆπτρον.

³³ E.g. 12.18, 23 δεῦρ' ἴθι, 34 χαῖρε, θεά (also 15.44); 14.5 κλυθι, 24 κέλομαι.

³⁴ E.g. 11.25–44 *passim*; 12.1 Διὸς τέκος, ἰοχέαιρα (also 15.19, 45), 19 δασπλήτι (also 15.48); 13.21Α κραίηνῃ; 14.1–2, 9 δολόεσσα, 25 βοῶπι; 15.3 ἡριγένεια, 23 ἔλαφῃβόλε, 31 κυδιάνειρα, 52 κυανέα.

CONCLUSIONS

only within a Greek religious background³⁵ or thanks to their original use in the Homeric text.³⁶ The exceptions are **10** and **13**, in which Homeric expressions are almost absent.

It is certainly true that the use of Homer in the *PGM* does not imply perforce a specific cultural background, since the Homeric texts circulated widely in Egypt and were also read by educated Egyptians – especially priests.³⁷ However, the magical hymns seem to re-employ the Homeric texts in two different ways. In one case, it is a matter of mechanical pasting of pattern expressions or verses;³⁸ in the other, the language is used more inventively, reworked and re-adapted to fit the new context, but often in line with Greek tradition, as if the authors, apart from drawing patterns from the Homeric ‘texts’, felt free to draw inspiration from Homeric ‘vocabulary’ too. While the first case implies only the availability of the Homeric text and the ability of understanding it, the second also implies so high a degree of acquaintance with the Homeric lexicon as to feel authorized to modify the way in which it was originally used. As already stated in the Introduction (see **Intro.** pp. 4–5, 11), even if speaking of ethnicity, after generations of cultural contact, does not make much sense for example in second-century Egypt, we can certainly speak of a cultural background that is, mainly, the kind of education an individual received. Therefore, as far as the use of Homeric language is concerned, it seems that the solar hymns – and possibly the lunar **10** and **13** – could also have had an Egyptian cultural

³⁵ Eg. see **11.34** Δωδωνή, Ἰδαῖα, 44 ιοχέαυρα (assimilation Artemis-Hecate, also **12.1**, **14.2**, **15.21**, 45); **12.1** Διὸς τέκος (assimilation Artemis-Hecate, also **15.45**), 2 ἐλαφιβόλε (Artemis-Hecate); **14.3** εὐπατόρεια (parentage with Zeus=assimilation Artemis-Hecate); **15.23** ἐλαφιβόλε (Artemis-Hecate).

³⁶ E.g. see **11.35** οὐλοή (used for Moira), χαροπή (used for lions), 41 λιπαροπλόκαμε (Ate), 43 δολόεσσα (Circe, also **14.9**); **12.19** δασπλήτι (for Erinys, also **15.48**).

³⁷ Schwendner 2002; cf. **Intro.** n.11 and n.12.

³⁸ Cf. the *Homeromanteia* or single Homeric verses used as magical formulae (see **Intro.** n.74).

background, while a stronger Greek background seems to underlie the remaining compositions.

Judaeo-Christian vocabulary

Not surprisingly, most of the expressions and vocabulary that can be traced back with certainty to Judaeo-Christian literature appear to be clustered in the solar hymns.³⁹ Attestations in the Apollonian hymns are rare and mainly limited to *voces magicae* and, in one case (7.35–7), to a brief non-metrical section that could be easily considered a later addition.⁴⁰ In the lunar hymns they are even scarcer compared to the length of the compositions, and often involve very general terms.⁴¹

Of course, one could infer that it would be improbable to find Judaeo-Christian ‘epithets’ attributed to the chthonic/lunar goddess since the Judaeo-Christian God is male. But when Isidorus calls Isis παντοκράτειρα, or the *OH* use the same term for Nature and Persephone,⁴² it seems that gender was not a big problem. Interestingly, when our lunar hymns want to express the ‘all-ruling’ function of the goddess (13.21, 15.35) they choose the classical τύραννε or the epic

³⁹ E.g. 1.5–17 *passim*, 18–19 ἅγια, θεῖον πνεῦμα, 32 προπάτωρ (also 2.22A, 25B, 5.10), αὐτογένεθλε; 3.14–15, 17 Μιχαήλ, 21 παντοκράτωρ, 22–3 Σαβῶθ, Ἀδωναί, 25 αὐτομαθής, ἀδίδακτος, 29 σφραγίδα θεοῦ; 4.1, 2 παντὸς κτίστα, 3 πνεύματι θεῷ; 9.4, 5 εἷς θεός, 7, 11. Even if Judaeo-Christian authors prefer πᾶς to κόσμος (see 1.10 πάτερ κόσμοιο), 2.10, 23A δέσποτα κόσμου, 25B κόσμου πάτερ and 3.9 κόσμου γενέτωρ, can be added to the list. Cf. also those terms that, when appearing alone, are too generic to be ascribed with certainty to a Judaeo-Christian background: 1.2 κύριε, 3 δέσποτα.

⁴⁰ No specifically Judaeo-Christian language in 6; 7.35 αὐτεξούσιον, 36–7 (non-metrical section); 8.24 and 32 Σαβῶθ.

⁴¹ No specifically Judaeo-Christian language in 12, 13 and 14; 10.14 and 29 κυρία; 11.1, 82 and 91 ταρταροῦχε, 40 ἁγία; possibly 15.1 δέσποινα as feminine of δεσπότης (all of them quite generic); 15.35 ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, 36 αἰώνιε.

⁴² Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.2; *OH* 10.4, 29.10.

CONCLUSIONS

ἀνάσσω instead of the feminine of more typically Judaeo-Christian expressions such as παντοκράτωρ or δέσποτα κόσμου/πάντων. Furthermore, all the 'Judaeo-Christian' epithets found in the lunar hymns may be explained within a Greek background – even the phrase ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος (see 15.35). Therefore, we could certainly talk about a certain penetration of 'Judaeo-Christian jargon', which is normal considering how the diffusion of some expressions was fostered by their popularity in the Judaeo-Christian milieu,⁴³ but it would be unwarranted to state that lunar hymns show any intention to convey Judaeo-Christian conceptions through the use of such a generic Judaeo-Christian vocabulary.

On the contrary, when we find phrases such as ἄγγελε πρῶτε θεοῦ (see 1.5) or κύριε, παντοκράτωρ ἅγιε καὶ δέσποτα πάντων (see 9.11), it is impossible to deny the authors' reference to Judaeo-Christian sources or, at least, their awareness of Judaeo-Christian literature. However, it has been noticed that the conception of divinity expressed by solar hymns is often in contrast with Jewish and Christian religion. Even in 1.5–17 – the section rich in Judaeo-Christian elements that can easily be detached from the rest as later addition – the presence of Zeus, the confusion between the archangels, the insistence on solar traits, and the allusion to the cosmic nature of the god suggest that the section had been already reworked to fit a new, different context (see Commentary *ad loc.*). Exactly as happened with Homeric language in the Apollonian and lunar hymns, the authors seem to have felt free to draw epithets and pattern expressions from Judaeo-Christian literature and re-adapt them at their pleasure. As before, this freedom to 'interfere' with the sources seems to suggest a higher degree of acquaintance with the concepts they expressed,

⁴³ See the example of κύριος, 1.2.

and, especially, the ability to recognize in the sources some pieces of information that could have proved useful to describe the deities invoked in the ‘new’ magical hymns.

Comparison with the *Orphic Hymns*

Throughout the commentary it has been noted how our hymns share a noteworthy amount of their vocabulary with the *OH*. Of course, as the *OH* largely employ Homeric language⁴⁴ and sometimes also Judaeo-Christian jargon,⁴⁵ it is often impossible to distinguish between the various contributions. In many other cases the vocabulary, though typical, is not exclusive to the *OH*,⁴⁶ which again makes it difficult to trace a background with certainty. However, some epithets acquire a special interest since they are used in the *OH* for deities comparable or identical to those addressed by magical hymns.

For example, αὐτοφυῆ, ἀκάμας, φερέσβιε and δέσποτα κόσμου can be used for Helios (1.16, 7.18, 28, 2.10, 23A);⁴⁷ κόσμον ἐλαύνων, σκηπτοῦχος and βαρύμηνι for Zeus (3.25, 7.3, 28, 8); κύδιμε, φαεσίμβροτε and ἐκάεργε for Apollo (7.3, 7, 2.23A, 6.2, 8.17). The instances become more numerous in the lunar hymns: for example, εἰνοδία (10.30, 12.35, 14.8, 15.46), τριοδίτι (12.4, 14.10, 15.25), οὐρανία (12.32, 35, 46), χθονία (12.25), φιλήρεμε/φιλέρημε (15.16), κλειδοῦχε (10.4)

⁴⁴ E.g. ἄναξ/ἄνασσα (1.1, 7.3, 11.39), ἀκάματον πῦρ (2.2, 12.5, 15.26), φαεσίμβροτος (2.23A, 15.3), ἔρχεο (6.1, 8.34), ἐκάεργε (6.2, 8.17), σκηπτοῦχος (7.3, 28), γαῖήοχον (7.14), ἀκάμας (7.18), ἰοχέαιρα (11.44, 12.1, 14.2, 15.21, 45), ἐλαφιβόλε (12.2, 15.23), εὐπατόρεια (14.3), κυδιάνειρα (15.31); cf. φερέσβιε (7.28) already in the *HH*. On the language of the *OH* see Rudhardt 2008, especially 171–6, 190–2, 195–7, 220–35.

⁴⁵ E.g. δεσπότης (1.3), αἰώνιος (1.15, 12.36, 15.36), δέσποτα κόσμου (2.10, 23A), παντοκράτωρ (3.21, 9.11).

⁴⁶ E.g. σὲ καλῶ (1.7, 7.33, 14.9, 12), ἀεροφοίτητος in its variant ἀερόφοιτος/ἡερόφοιτος (2.1), λίτομαί σε (2.10, 12.38), or λίτομαι (5.7), Ἥη (7.3, 29), ἀστυφέλικτε (7.16 also used by Christian authors), ἀεροειδῆ (7.35, perhaps Homeric), πολύμορφε (8.26, 14.9, 15.9), νεῦσον (5.7, 11.8), δράκαινα (11.58), ταυρωπὼν (15.17).

⁴⁷ For all the precise references see commentary *ad loc.*

CONCLUSIONS

and ἡγεμόνη (14.4) all appear together in *OH* 1 to Hecate; again κλειδοῦχε, plus πολώνυμε (14.23, 15.20, 31), σώτειρα (11.37) and σεμνή (14.8), appear in *OH* 2 to Prothyraia;⁴⁸ φρασφόρε (12.23) and δαδοῦχε (12.32, 14.4) are used for Selene (*OH* 9); κερόεσσα (15.32) and again σεμνή for Persephone (*OH* 29); again πολώνυμε, σεμνή, δαδοῦχε, χθονία, σώτειρα, plus λοχιάς/λοχεία (11.42), ιοχέαιρα and ἐλαφηβόλε (see **Concl.** n.44) and θηροκτόνε (12.18, 14.8) appear as epithets of Artemis (*OH* 36); again ἡγεμόνη, πολώνυμε, χθονία, plus πρέσβειρα (11.31), ἀδαμάστωρ (14.3), Δίκη (15.7, 50), Πειθώ (12.22) and πυρίπνου (12.32, 14.10) are all used for Nature in *OH* 10; again οὐρανία, σεμνή, Πειθώ, εὐπατόρεια (14.3) and λύκαινα (11.59, 12.24) appear as epithets of Aphrodite in *OH* 55; finally, νυχία (10.3, 12.18, 25, 15.47) can be used for the Eumenides/Erinyes (*OH* 70.9) and possibly for Selene (*OH* 9.6).

The lexical correspondences become even more significant when epithets or longer phrases are attested exclusively, or almost exclusively, in these two corpora:

Solar hymns

Exclusively: (Διὸς) ὄμμα τέλειον, 3.18; κλήζω σε, 1.20, 2.7, 3.10; κλυθί, μάκαρ, 1.20, 2.7.

Almost exclusively: πάντα κρατύνεις, 9.6.

Apollonian hymns

Almost exclusively: νυκτερόφοιτε, 8.25 (but possibly an insertion from the attributes of the lunar goddess, see Commentary *ad loc.*).

Lunar hymns

Exclusively: πυρίφοιτε/ἐμπυρίφοιτος, 14.25; θεῶν γενέτειρα, 15.32.

Almost exclusively: πανδώτειρα, 11.38; ῥηξίχθων, 14.7, 29; πανδαμάτειρα, 14.7; νυκτὸς ἄγαλμα, 15.3; Φύσι παμμήτωρ, 15.33; ὀφιοπλόκαμε, 15.52.

⁴⁸ Cf. 10.4, κλειδοῦχε.

Considering these instances, in the solar hymns the use of the vocabulary of the *OH* resembles the use of Homeric language: all the occurrences are pattern phrases. At the same time, those epithets that, though possibly Homeric or Judaeo-Christian, or just more generally common, can be taken into consideration owing to a correspondence of addressees in the two corpora (see here above), do not convey any divine feature that can be unambiguously ascribed to a Greek background: αὐτοφυῆ, δέσποτα κόσμου, κόσμον ἐλαύνων and φασείμβροτε. In the Apollonian hymns we find the epithet νυκτερόφοιτε, and the ‘not necessarily Orphic’ epithets become more frequent (6, 7 and 8, also **Concl.** n.44, 46 and above). Among them, at least ἐκάεργε can certainly be said to describe the traditional Apollo. Finally, in the lunar hymns we find not only pattern phrases, but also almost all the epithets that are exclusive, or almost exclusive, to the two corpora – not to mention the correspondences in usage between epithets and addressees as far as ‘not necessarily Orphic’ terms are concerned (see here above). Not surprisingly, it is in these hymns that we find most epithets conveying a specifically Greek divine feature, for example ὄφροπλόκαμε, εἰνοδία, τριοδίτι, φασεφόρε, δαδοῦχε, Πειθώ and all the epithets implying the identification Artemis-Hecate such as ἰοχέαιρα, ἐλαφηβόλε and θηροκτόνε (see Commentary *ad loc.*).

Moreover, it is interesting to note that two phrases used in solar hymns, (Διὸς) ὄμμα τέλειον and πάντα κρατύνει (exclusively/almost exclusively attested in these two corpora), appear in the *OH* within compositions addressed to female deities that are assimilated with Hecate in the magical hymns. The first appears in *OH* 59.13 to the Moirai, and the second refers to Ananke in 3.11 to Nyx. Also, νυκτερόφοιτε (the only epithet in the Apollonian hymns that, owing to its rarity, is more likely to belong to the vocabulary of the the *OH*) is used as an epithet of Artemis in *OH* 36.6. This might suggest that, if some *OH*, or comparable sources from a similar milieu, were consulted by

CONCLUSIONS

the authors of the magical hymns, they could all have been addressed to female deities. That is, if we want to assume an infiltration of the vocabulary of the *OH* into the magical hymns, it could have occurred via contact with one subgroup of texts: hymns addressed to female deities. Even in this case, the analysis of the language employed with relation to the contents conveyed stresses the difference in cultural background between the solar hymns and the lunar/Apollonian ones.

Style and structure

In the conclusions to the single hymns, some remarks on structure and style have been provided, for example the hymns often appeared to be the result of the juxtaposition of sections of different origin. In spite of this frequent collage technique, the hymns as single wholes appear to be consistent in some stylistic and structural features.

We saw that one of the most distinctive structural components of traditional Greek hymns, the *hypomnēsis*, appears only twice in two Apollonian hymns (6, 8). Even 7, in which a proper *hypomnēsis* is missing, somehow compensates for this absence with its initial section (see Conclusions *ad loc.*). In fact, these compositions are the ones showing a higher degree of continuity with the standard style of Greek hymnography. Hymn 6 sticks to tradition, since it does not even include long series of epithets or of one-line participial phrases, and its *hypomnēsis* (6.6–8, referring to the previous instances in which Apollo came to prophesy) describes the god as having performed specific actions in a specific time, in a ‘dynamische Prädikationsart’. Hymns 7 and 8 do incorporate enumerative sequences of epithets (7.13–18, 8.23–6), but the striking difference between them and the solar hymns is their narrative flavour. They both allude to a specific

mythology: the story of Apollo and Daphne, a precise event fixed in a precise – even if mythical – time and narrated in verbal style (7.1–2, 8.1–15, 31–2). In 7 this episode is more cursorily dealt with, but the account of Helios’ journey through the sky with its strong narrative flavour (7.20–6, see Conclusions *ad loc.*) provides enough narrative to ascribe this hymn to the same category as 8. It is noteworthy that in these Apollonian hymns the use of substantival participles or participial/relative clauses to describe the qualities/actions of the god is very rare;⁴⁹ the same applies to the use of polyptoton,⁵⁰ while the contrivance of *parallelismus membrorum* seems to be totally absent.

Moving on to the solar hymns, we saw how, in syntactically developed ‘praising sections’, proper narrative is missing in most cases. From a stylistic point of view, the peculiarity of these hymns is that they often use participial and/or relative clauses⁵¹ or one-line appositional phrases that serve as epithets.⁵² They also appear to have a certain taste for *parallelismus membrorum*, especially expressed in anaphoral sequences,⁵³ and for polyptoton.⁵⁴ Furthermore, even when verbal patterns are employed, they almost never describe the deity’s actions in time,⁵⁵ but deal with the ‘always-true’ essence of the god,⁵⁶ as typical of the ‘essentielle Prädikationsart’ of Egyptian, or generally Near Eastern, hymnography. When expressions implying a divine action

⁴⁹ E.g. 7.4, 19, 36–7; 8.21–2 (but the lines are Homeric). ⁵⁰ 7.7, 18.

⁵¹ E.g. 1.8–9, 17; 2.1–4, 25A; 3.16, 18–19, 23–4; 4.3, 5; 5.3–5.

⁵² E.g. 1.5–6, 11–16 (in both instances the listed entries are interpreted as ‘symbolic’ of the god, see Commentary 1), 33, 35; 3.11, 14–15.

⁵³ E.g. 1.8–9, 11–14, 33–5; 2.4; 3.10–11; 5.1–4; 9.1–4.

⁵⁴ E.g. 1.15, 16, 32; 2.25B; 3.13, 19, 24; 4.1–2, 4; 9.4, 6, 11.

⁵⁵ The only exception would seem that the god taught men the art of prophecy, see 1.29, 2.18–19A, 21B.

⁵⁶ E.g. 1.5–7, 10–16, 20–1, 34–5; 2.1, 7–8, 10, 25A; 3.11, 14–15, 18, 21, 24–5, 29–31; 5.4–6; 9.2, 4–6.

CONCLUSIONS

are used they describe atemporal cyclic events⁵⁷ or creational acts set at the beginning of time,⁵⁸ which prevents the development of proper narrative and resembles what Assmann called 'Verklären' in relation to Egyptian hymns. Even hymn 4, for which a difference in style has been noticed (see Conclusions *ad loc.*), does not really depart from the standard pattern: one participial phrase and one substantival participle are present anyway (4.3, 5) and, especially, the contents conveyed stick to the creational and 'always-true' actions of the deity. Similarly, in hymn 9, despite the strong narrative style (see Conclusions *ad loc.*), the contents conveyed do not imply any actual mythology. When the divine actions are not creational, they are atemporal since they describe activities that are continuously performed by the god such as the generation of earth's produce or the exertion of the divine dominion over the cosmos.⁵⁹

The syntactically developed 'praising sections' of the lunar hymns are not so definite as far as the use of relative/participial versus verbal phrases is concerned. These hymns can employ both stylistic patterns without any patent preference,⁶⁰ but verbal phrases are much more frequent than in solar hymns, which gives these compositions a more narrative character. Similarly, we can find specific mythological references⁶¹ and both verbal and participial/relative phrases can also be used to express actions and attributes that are not atemporal, cyclical, or

⁵⁷ E.g. 1.8-9, 17; 2.2-4, 11; 3.16, 23.

⁵⁸ E.g. 1.33; 2.4-5; 3.19 (or 'always true', depending on interpretations); 4.3-5; 5.3; 9.1, 3.

⁵⁹ Hymn 9, see **Concl.** nn.56, 58.

⁶⁰ E.g. participial/relative: 11.3, 88, 95; 12.5-6, 19, 26-7, 31; 14.5-6, 10; 15.4-7, 10-15, 18, 21, 26-7, 29, 48. Verbal: 11.89, 12.8-9, 27-8; 13.15-20 (though this section could be considered as part of the magical ritual, it describes what would be actions already performed by the goddess, and not actions that are expected by the magician from the goddess); 15.8, 17, 19, 33-41, 43.

⁶¹ 13.19-20; 15.37-41.

creational.⁶² For example, the description of the goddess as the one 'who shakes her hair of frightful snakes from her forehead, who raises bulls' bellows from her mouth' does not express an essential, 'always true' aspect. Of course, we can imagine that shaking the hair and raising a bull's bellow are typical activities of the goddess, or that every time the goddess sends out her voice it sounds like a bull's bellow, but she is not continuously or cyclically performing these actions. Finally, the lunar hymns present a certain taste for *parallelismus membrorum*,⁶³ though they mainly use it outside the 'praising sections' with few exceptions especially in 11,⁶⁴ while polyptoton is practically absent.⁶⁵

As far as long strings of epithets are concerned, they can be found in all categories of hymns but are especially developed in the lunar hymns. When we consider what kind of divine attributes these enumerative passages describe, we find the same differences noted before. The epithets in the solar hymns stick to 'always true' attributes and describe the essence of the god: e.g. 'first father', 'elder one', 'self-engendered', 'master/father of the cosmos',⁶⁶ but also 'fire-bringer', 'gold-shining', or 'who rise burning',⁶⁷ (the sun god cyclically brings the sun flame, shines like gold and rises burning). Even saying that the god 'is' – and not 'becomes' – a

⁶² Verbal: e.g. 11.89 (the goddess does not continuously look at the magician); 12.8–9 (the goddess does not shout continuously, cyclically, or at the beginning of time; shouting dreadfully is something she can do from time to time, but does not describe her essence); 13.15–20 (the killing of a man cannot be seen as an 'essential', atemporal action). Participial/relative: e.g. 14.5 (the opening of the doors of the Underworld might be seen as a cyclical act if we put it in connection with the new moon phase, but generally speaking it should be ascribed among the actions Hecate can perform from time to time), 6 (the goddess was an overseer but she is no longer).

⁶³ E.g. 10.20–1, 26–7; 11.19–20; 12.11–12; 13.3–4A.

⁶⁴ E.g. 11.1–2, 24–5, 88–9; 15.8–9, 36 (but in a pattern phrase of clear Greek origin).

⁶⁵ E.g. 14.17; the insistence on the number three especially in compounds is just repetition, but we may consider 12.6 (paralleled in 15.27).

⁶⁶ 1.32; 2.22A, 25B; 3.9; 5.10; cf. 4.2; 9.11.

⁶⁷ 2.23A; 3.13.

CONCLUSIONS

scarab, a serpent, or a lion⁶⁸ is just a way to endow him with the functions represented by his animal manifestations and represents an 'always true' aspect of the deity. Not by chance, iconographical features such as clothing, physical appearance, objects held or used by the deity, are absent with the exception only of χρυσοκόμα (2.2, 3.10). At the same time, it is hardly possible to find any epithet connecting the god with a specific mythology or cultic reality: there are no patronymics, nor epithets referring to mythological episodes, and only two cultic toponyms in 1.3 mentioned as the places from which the god is supposed to come and not as divine epithets.⁶⁹

On the contrary, in the Apollonian hymns, both these kinds of epithets start to appear and the god can be 'Leto's son', the one 'who darts afar' (in connection with the use of the bow), or 'with famous steeds', 'with the golden headband', 'plate-bearing', 'with glowing breastplate' and 'golden bridles', 'sceptre-bearer', 'with ivy-wreathed hair', 'with the silver bow'.⁷⁰ He can also be the 'Python-slayer' (8.23), epithet referring to a specific mythological event set in a specific mythical time. Obviously, the real reasons behind this difference are theological, and will be discussed later. For now, it can be noticed that these iconographical features hardly describe the essence of the deity. Having 'golden hair', for example, may be an 'always true' characteristic of Apollo, but it says nothing about his nature. At the same time, the fact that he 'darts afar' and has a 'silver bow' may convey his apotropaic function, but it cannot be said to be 'always true' unless we imagine the god continuously darting around or carrying a bow. These epithets are 'dynamic' and not 'essential' as they imply divine actions that are not necessarily continuous, cyclical or creational, and thus cannot be placed outside the time continuum. Every time Apollo darts, he darts afar; every time he carries a bow,

⁶⁸ 3.10–11; 5.1, 5.

⁶⁹ 'Leave Mount Parnassus and the Delphic Pytho.'

⁷⁰ 6.2; 7.14, 17–18, 28–9; 8.17, 21.

it is a silver bow, but he is not performing these actions constantly or cyclically, and certainly not at the beginning of time. On the other hand, an epithet such as ἀπότροπε (6.2), not referring to an iconography, does express both an 'essential' divine feature – the apotropaic function – and an 'always true' aspect.

The content conveyed by the epithets in the lunar hymns is not much different since these compositions can also include iconographical features that do not tell us anything about the nature of the goddess, 'dynamic' features, mythological references, patronymics and cultic toponyms. For example, 'with a gold crown', 'with a headband', 'with shining hair';⁷¹ 'who draws swords', 'who aims well', 'who cries with a recent pain', 'who helps during childbirth', 'shooter of arrows', 'deer huntress', 'wild beast slayer', 'who brings many pains', 'mountain wanderer';⁷² 'protectress of Dione';⁷³ 'goddess of Dodona, of Ida', 'Theban', 'Lydian', 'child of Zeus', 'daughter of a noble father'.⁷⁴

Therefore, it must be stressed that the various enumerative passages appearing in the hymns do not seem to have a common background despite their stylistic similarities. In fact, a stylistic contrivance particularly appreciated in a specific period could indeed be adopted by anyone composing in Greek, but what makes the actual difference is the kind of religious conceptions that single epithets can convey. Not by chance, as seen in the commentary, many compound epithets appearing in the solar hymns could have been chosen – if not invented⁷⁵ – in order to render an Egyptian original. Similarly, *parallelismus membrorum* and polyptoton, though particularly appreciated in Egyptian hymnography, are not

⁷¹ 11.30, 33, 41.

⁷² 11.26, 32, 34, 42, 44; 12.1–2, 18, 20, 35; 14.2; 15.23, 46.

⁷³ 14.1 (in case this reading, or the reading 'protectress of Deo's daughter', is accepted, see Commentary *ad loc.*).

⁷⁴ 11.34, 43; 12.1; 14.3.

⁷⁵ Cf. e.g. 1.32 αὐτογένεθλε; 2.22Α αὐτολόχευτε.

CONCLUSIONS

exclusive to Egyptian poetry, and so they will be more likely to echo the Egyptian style when used in comparable contexts (such as 'praising sections') and expressing concepts traceable to an Egyptian background. This seems to be the case in solar hymns, while in lunar hymns the ascription of these figures of speech to a cultural setting is much more uncertain.

The last noteworthy structural feature to consider is the interference of the magical ritual. First, *voces magicae* are found in all the compositions with the exception of **9**,⁷⁶ but, since they can be easily detached from the hymns as later interpolations, it is more interesting to analyse the allusions to magical procedures other than *voces magicae*. We saw that references to the ritual are found in all categories of hymns. For example, **1** and **2** devote between two and twelve lines to the ritual procedure performed by the magician and his request to send a daimon;⁷⁷ **3** may hint at the magical formula (the name of god) pronounced by the magician;⁷⁸ in **5**, three lines tell us the 'mystic symbols' that the performer is going to recite;⁷⁹ the Apollonian hymns specify that the god has to come to prophesy and also add some rubrics or allusions describing the ritual procedure;⁸⁰ **10** and **14** devote twenty-three and eighteen lines respectively to describe the magician's ritual actions and what he expects from the deity;⁸¹ in **11** and **13** the magical procedure is the fulcrum of the whole hymn; **12** and **15** allude to a burnt

⁷⁶ In **4.4**, 7 $\varphi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\epsilon\delta\omega\delta\omega\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\iota\sigma\gamma\eta\nu\omicron\nu\iota\delta\eta$ are probably just unexplained readings and not *voces magicae*, but the hymn is framed by two long strings of magical names that were probably considered as attached to it (see introduction to **4**); similarly, the situation of **11**, immediately followed by a long series of *voces* (see introduction to **11**); **12** displays only one *vox*, $\mu\alpha\rho\zeta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\eta$ (line 22).

⁷⁷ **1.18**–19, 22–8, 30–1; **2A.11**–17, 20–1, **2B.11**–20, 22–4, **2C.11**–12; cf. also **1.2**, 4.

⁷⁸ **3.8**, 29. ⁷⁹ **5.7**–9.

⁸⁰ **6.3**–5 (prophesy at night), 8; **7.5**–6, 10–12, 30; **8.10**–14, 18–20, 30, 34–5.

⁸¹ **10.6**–28; **14.12**–22, 31–8.

offering and to the intervention expected from the goddess, but **12** also specifies that the spell in an ἄγωγή.⁸²

The intrusion of magical ritual seems to be uniformly distributed, but for example in the Apollonian hymns, nothing could be unambiguously ascribed to a magical milieu, as the passages referring to the performer's action and to the expected outcome could also fit the cultic setting of an oracular consultation. At the same time, in the solar hymns the ritual sections are sometimes totally absent (**4**, **9** and possibly **3**) or can easily be detached from the rest, while it is only in the lunar hymns that we find instances for which it is almost impossible to separate ritual from praising passages or to imagine an earlier, 'non-magical', stage of composition (**10**, **11**, **13**). In **11**, it is hardly even possible to talk of a proper 'praising' since most passages describing the attributes of the goddess are targeted at enforcing or depicting the magical threat. The only section listing divine aspects without any reference to the ritual is the long series of epithets in 25–44. Unfortunately, this is also the only section that could be detached from the hymn as a later interpolation.

Finally, the solar and Apollonian ritual sections involve procedures that are difficult to trace back to a specific cultural environment.⁸³ On the contrary, lunar ritual sections employ magical methods that seem to have originated both in Greek (cursing/attracting ἄγωγή in **10**, **12** and **14**, see **10.22–8**) and Egyptian magical practice (cosmic threat and slander in **11** and **13**, see **11.11–16**, 68–73, **13.1–18**). The general impression is that the lunar hymns **10**, **11** and **13** do not necessarily have to represent a final magical stage of re-elaboration of previous sources, but could have been directly composed in a magical milieu *ex novo*, simply drawing inspiration from different sources. On the contrary, for none of the solar or Apollonian hymns is it possible to hypothesize with certainty a direct

⁸² **12.1**, 18, 37; **15.2**, 45, 55.

⁸³ See 'Deities in context' above.

CONCLUSIONS

composition in a magical milieu; they seem to have assembled material of different origin which subsequently underwent a magical reworking in order to fit a new magical purpose. In particular, the Apollonian hymns at a previous stage could have belonged to the cultic sphere of Apollonian oracles.

In conclusion, the analysis of the main linguistic, stylistic and structural features of the magical hymns always tends to lead to similar outcomes. As we have seen, magical hymns can sometimes be dismembered with a good degree of certainty into sections that appear to have a different origin. If we distinguish these sections according to their function – for example, magical ritual related versus praising sections,⁸⁴ or sections praising deity A included in a hymn praising deity B⁸⁵ – we will see that they can be found in all categories of hymns. However, if we try to distinguish them according to their cultural background, we will find that they appear mainly in the solar hymns. They are rare in the Apollonian,⁸⁶ and when present in lunar hymns they involve either the magical procedure only, or passages that do not directly describe the deity, and, as far as linguistic/stylistic features are concerned, are difficult to place in an unambiguous cultural background.⁸⁷

⁸⁴ E.g. **1.1–17** (praising), **18–31** (ritual); **5.1–6** (praising), **7–9** (ritual); **10.1–5** (praising), **6–28** (ritual); **14.1–11**, **23–30** (praising), **12–22**, **31–8** (ritual).

⁸⁵ Even if the deities are at this stage identified, e.g. **1.1–3** (to Apollo); **7.13–26** (to Helios); **12.27–30** (to Aphrodite-Gaea-Nature).

⁸⁶ Possibly a Judaeo-Christian-influenced section in **7.33–7**, but non-metrical.

⁸⁷ **12.10–17** (cf. **15.30**) could copy the cosmic awe reactions typical of solar hymns but, since they can derive from different cultural backgrounds, their ‘origin’ can vary according to the context (see **1.10**, **3.1–8**); similar situation in **15.35–6**; **13.1–18** involves only an Egyptian magical procedure; in **11** the influence of Egyptian magical practice is not gathered in a detachable section and even **68–73** (the apex of the cosmic threat), apart from being adapted to a Greek mythological context, refers to the magical procedure and does not describe the deity’s attributes.

At the same time, every category of hymns seems to have a preferred vocabulary to draw inspiration from: Judaeo-Christian for the solar hymns, Homeric for the Apollonian, and the vocabulary of the *OH* for the lunar hymns. But the solar hymns are the only ones widely ranging over the three 'jargons' since in Apollonian and lunar hymns the use of Judaeo-Christian vocabulary is reduced to a minimum. At the same time, Apollonian and lunar hymns are the only ones employing Homeric and 'Orphic' vocabularies with a higher degree of freedom, while in solar hymns the presence of these 'jargons' looks like the result of the use of different sources during the composition process.

In spite of this juxtaposition of sections and use of mixed vocabulary, all categories of hymns are consistent in style and contents. The solar hymns stick to the 'essentielle Prädikationsart' typical of Egyptian hymnography (such as the use of *parallelismus membrorum* and polyptoton within the praising of the deity), while Apollonian and lunar hymns can also display a 'dynamische Prädikationsart'. Therefore, the lunar hymns, in spite of the interminable series of epithets, the interference of the magical ritual, and the higher probability of their having been composed directly for magical purposes, are much closer to traditional Greek poetry than one could tell at a first reading as far as underlying religious conceptions are concerned. The Apollonian hymns, with their scant magical interferences, predominance of Homeric vocabulary, and long-standing Apollo-Helios equation, are the closest to Greek tradition. As far as we can tell from internal references, they could have belonged to the cultic sphere of oracular consultation and slightly been adapted to fit the new magical context (cf. I n.499).

Magical hymns can often appear as a jumble of different traditions where the deities and their attributes seem to have been amassed for the sake of completeness every time a comparison was possible. So we find Apollo together with Iao and Adonai invoked as the 'eternal God' of

CONCLUSIONS

Judaean-Christian literature (1), Helios-Horus (2), the Titan (Helios) called Adonai and scarab at the same time (3), or Hecate-Artemis-Persephone-Aphrodite together with the Babylonian Ereškigal and apparently identified with Isis-Hathor in the lunar hymns. The first impression is of dealing with 'syncretistic' compositions where different deities with their cultural backgrounds had been placed side by side in order to create a new divinity. However, the consistency in style and contents displayed by every category of hymns suggests that, at least in their final stage of composition, only one religious conception at a time was operating on the author's choices. For the assembler of the solar hymns, the provenance of the sources employed does not seem to have had any importance as far as contents and style fitted with, or could be readapted to, the kind of divinity he was trying to describe. The general impression is that the authors of solar hymns were lacking in Greek expressive patterns for the ideas they wanted to convey and looked for them wherever they could, without worrying about joining different cultural backgrounds whenever useful in describing the deity they had in mind. This technique is more likely to have been employed to render conceptions that were originally expressed in a different language, which would also fit with the predominance of the 'essentielle Prädikationsart'. In fact, as a specific theological conception implies a specific style of predication, the different elements seem to have been chosen or adapted to fit as far as possible what must have been the stylistic form in which the deity in question was originally praised.

Furthermore, the god invoked by the solar hymns is a supreme-creator god, and thus the abundant use of Judaean-Christian language could seem just a natural choice. But the reason why Apollonian and lunar hymns almost never use specific Judaean-Christian vocabulary does not seem to be the supreme or not supreme nature of the deities they praise. For an epithet such as παντοκράτωρ, conceptually speaking, could have easily been substituted for κοίρανε κόσμου (7.13)

DIVINE ATTRIBUTES IN CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS

or πάντων δὲ σὺ μούνη ἀνάσσεις (15.35). It seems that the authors of these hymns did not feel the necessity to use Judaeo-Christian sources or vocabulary since, for the kind of divinity they were trying to describe, they could draw all they needed from the Greek religious tradition even when this divinity assumed supreme-creative characteristics. This, together with the other stylistic and linguistic features, suggests that the deities invoked in these hymns could be understood simply in the light of Greek polytheism. In conclusion, the analysis of the different vocabularies, style and structure in combination with the contents they express seems to substantiate the existence of three groups of compositions, which had already been inferred from the investigation of the religious conceptions within the commentaries to the single hymns.

DIVINE ATTRIBUTES IN CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS

We saw how, in the solar hymns, the divine features that give proper information about the nature of the deity, when considered all together, can make sense only in the light of the Egyptian theology of solar-creator gods. The only exception is **9**, which can be consistent with both a Jewish and an Egyptian background (see Conclusions *ad loc.*) In these hymns, the presence of elements that escape an Egyptian interpretation appears to be due to the method of composition since they do not alter the essence of the deity. At the same time, these ‘foreign’ elements often look like an attempt to make the deity invoked more comprehensible to a Hellenized ‘audience’. For example, the Apollonian lines in 1.1–3 have clearly been added because Apollo-Helios was comparable to the solar god praised by the hymn, but they do not alter the nature of the god. If the passage had said that Apollo was, for example, the ‘far-darter’, the ‘leader of the Muses’ or the ‘averted of evil’, we would have had an actual superimposition of divine

CONCLUSIONS

attributes, but in this case Apollo's proper functions remain unexpressed.⁸⁸

Again, in the 'Judaeo-Christian' section 1.5–17, the content of the passage, together with the parallel in 3.14–17, 23, makes it clear that all the names are used as magical names of the supreme god – as normally happens in magical literature – and that the one-line phrases are used as his epithets (see 1.5–10, 11–18). While pasting in a section, a phrase such as 'first angel of the god' did not have to be excluded as it was conceived as a powerful epithet in its original context and did not substantially alter the other divine features. At the same time, the insistence on solar traits and the allusions to the cosmic nature of the god suggest that either the passage was originally composed in a mixed cultural milieu, or it had been subsequently modified. In some cases these additions or adaptations insert a Greek contribution such as the mention of Zeus and Olympos,⁸⁹ but specific references to Greek mythology are not present.

In 2.2 and 3.10 the god is called 'golden-haired', a typical epithet of Apollo-Helios with whom he was comparable. But this is the only iconographical feature in all the solar hymns, which suggests that anthropomorphic descriptions were not customary for the deity invoked and that the epithet, which does not alter the divine functions, was kept to give the god a 'Greek flavour'. Similarly, the 'Greek' description of the Underworld as the place where 'dwell daimons of men who once saw the light' in 2.8–9 comes together with the mention of Hades but for example has been cut from 1.21. Hymn 3 mentions Olympos (line 29) and 'laurel offerings and the doors of untamed Styx' (lines 27–8, though the phrase seems to display some Egyptian interference, see Commentary *ad loc.*), and we have already seen that the Homeric line in 5.2 seems to have been added to provide a Greek interpretation for

⁸⁸ Cf. also the curious statement (1.1) that Apollo has to 'come with Paian', but is not Paian.

⁸⁹ Also Hades and the Moirai at 1.21, 35, 30 (2.19–20A, 23B).

divine features otherwise difficult to understand (see 5.2 and Conclusions *ad* 5).

All these Greek contributions, though certainly present, either do not tell us anything about the nature of the deity, or do not go as far as altering it, so that they appear to be incidental or aimed at a Hellenized ‘audience’. The Egyptian solar-creator god described by the solar hymns lacks iconographical features since he is transcendent as primordial creator and ruler of all the cosmos, and in this respect resembles the Judaeo-Christian God whose epithets and names are so frequently found. But at the same time he is immanent as cosmic god, and in his identification with the physical sun resembles the Greek Apollo-Helios, whose name and epithets can appear in the text. However, in spite of the names or sporadic epithets, there is no actual fusion with Apollo as the distinctive Apollonian functions are not present. At the same time, the functions of Helios or of the Jewish God, though apparently present, are limited to the aspects that were already typical of Egyptian solar-creator gods, so that even in this case the text does not imply the identification of different deities, but only the adoption of different sources to describe the same deity. Thus, the extant solar hymns, as far as both style and contents are concerned, seem to have been originally compiled in an Egyptian cultural environment.

For the sake of a conceptual comparison it should be remembered that almost all the divine attributes described in our hymns can be found together in three⁹⁰ hymns to Amun-Re from the Persian-period temple of Hibis, often quoted within the commentary. As summarized in the Introduction, these hymns were very popular and a shorter version of two of them already appeared in the Harris magical papyrus (see **Intro.** pp. 36–7). Furthermore, the cosmic aspect of Amun was especially stressed in the Late period and developed also through

⁹⁰ Klotz 2006, II, III, IV.

CONCLUSIONS

the polymorphic deities who played an important role in magic and popular religion. In fact, the magical papyrus of the Brooklyn Museum, in which Bes-Pantheos is invoked with many earlier epithets of Amun-Re, has often been quoted too (see **Intro.** pp. 49–50, 77–8). It thus seems plausible to hypothesize that our hymns may stem from similar magical invocations to polymorphic deities, derived in their turn from the henotheistic-cosmic praises of the Theban Amun-Re.

As far as the Apollonian hymns are concerned, they describe the deity with the traditional features of Apollo-Helios: the god is not even incidentally said to be primordial or cosmic or to be the creator of the cosmos. He is just the ‘leader of the cosmos’ (7.13, cf. 36–7, 8.24 τῶρᾶννε), an attribute typical of Helios as the astral dominant power in the cosmic order. The god is Paian, and this time he ‘dwells in Colophon’; but he is also Ieios, Phoibos and Smintheus, protects Chryses and Cilla, is the ruler of Tenedos and the slayer of Python. Even the Greek mythological allusions that do not directly involve the deity are much more specific since we find the myth of Apollo and Daphne, the laurel as sacred plant of Apollo, the classical personifications of Dawn, Sunset and Night, and the Moirai are called by their personal names. The only elements that could not belong to the attributes of Apollo-Helios are uncertain (both ‘air-like’, see 7.35, and ‘storm’, see 8.23, do not have a univocal interpretation) or incidental (‘night-wanderer’, ‘with many forms’ and ‘fond of blood’, see 8.25–6, are likely to have been considered as *voces magicæ*). No other elements could be traced back with certainty to an Egyptian background, and even the possibly Judaeo-Christian ones (7.35–7) do not alter the nature of the god, who thus remains the traditional Apollo-Helios with no added creative, primordial or cosmic connotations. In terms of both content and style, the Apollonian hymns are likely to derive from a Greek cultural environment and, considering the stress put on the oracular function of the god, they could stem from the Apollonian oracles and Paeans that circulated in Graeco-Roman Egypt (see **Intro.** pp. 33–4).

The situation is a little more complex in the lunar hymns since the commentary has shown that they could imply an identification between Hecate and Isis-Hathor.⁹¹ If this were the case, we would have a real bilateral contribution, as the adoption of both Greek and Egyptian magical procedures would also suggest. Hecate's attributes that could indicate this identification are: her assimilation with the deities of fate;⁹² the statement that the goddess generates and rules over everything and her equation with Aphrodite;⁹³ her manifestation in bull form;⁹⁴ a few epithets typical of or attested for Isis.⁹⁵ In the Commentary and Conclusions to the single hymns, we saw how all these attributes can find a 'Greek' explanation too; now some further considerations are needed.

Apart from the Egyptian evidence, from the Hellenistic period onwards the Greek aretalogies and hymns to Isis represent the perfect ground for comparison to understand which epithets and functions were typical of the Hellenistic Isis, whether originally Egyptian or not.⁹⁶ First, it can be noted that Hecate's dominion over fate in the magical hymns is mainly stressed through her connection with a whole range of divine figures typical of Greek mythology: Ananke, Tyche and especially the Moirai and the Erinyes. Among these deities, the only one that can acquire a unilateral positive connotation is Tyche, but, since originally she embodied a neutral idea of luck, when good fortune is meant, the Greek adds the adjective ἀγαθός in the form ἀγαθὴ τύχη. This is the very expression employed for

⁹¹ Cf. Fauth 2006, 67–76.

⁹² See 10.14–16, 13.22, 11.25–44 **D**, κατακαμψυψαύχενε (14.4, if the emendation is correct), πανδαμάτειρα (14.7), 15.7–8, 37–41, 49–50.

⁹³ See 12.27–30, 15.32–6.

⁹⁴ See 12.23, 15.12, 16–17, 32.

⁹⁵ Such as κυρία (10.14, 29), πελαγινή (11.31) σώτειρα, (11.37), ἀνασσα (11.39, 12.38), μελανείμων (12.25, even if Isis is usually μελανηφόρος), μεγίστη (14.6), πολύμορφε (14.9, 15.9), πολυώνυμε (14.23, 36, 15.20, 31).

⁹⁶ See **Intro.** pp. 37–8, cf. pp. 9–10; Festugière 1949, especially 221–34; Vanderlip 1972, 93–6; Müller 1961, especially 19–85, for discussion of the single epithets and functions; Kockelmann 2008, especially 49–70; also Zabkar 1988, especially 146–56.

CONCLUSIONS

Isis in most cases, since her identification with Fate underlined her ability to secure good fate as benefactress.⁹⁷ Otherwise, we can find formulations such as ‘I defeated destiny (εἰμαρμένος)’, which seems again to imply that Isis is able to avert bad luck, and ‘destiny obeys me’,⁹⁸ recalling the Egyptian *šy-rrt-m-wdt.n.s*, ‘destiny and upbringing are under/at her command’, or *šy-m-‘.s*, ‘destiny is in her hand’;⁹⁹ but in any case Isis is never identified with the Moirai or Erinyes.¹⁰⁰

In our hymns, Hecate is called Tyche only in the two versions of **13.22**, and whenever she is associated with fate it is never specified that this fate is supposed to be good since she is obviously not acting as a beneficial goddess. Moreover, in many instances, we can connect Hecate with the Moirai/Erinyes only on the basis of a shared iconography and triplicity,¹⁰¹ which suggests that their identification was primarily iconographical and, in the case of the Erinyes, based on a shared chthonic, infernal nature. Exactly as the triple Hecate was associated with the triple Charites (see **15.7**), she could find an even stronger connection with the triple Moirai and the triple Erinyes as a dangerous Underworld deity: the Moirai, appointing the destinies, were often linked with death as the necessarily final outcome of human existence, exactly as the word *μοῖρα* refers more often to ill fortune and can mean simply ‘death’; the monstrous and avengeful Erinyes, when sent to redress a wrong, were normally death-bringers. The hymns identify Hecate with Ananke only once (**15.49**),

⁹⁷ E.g. *RICIS passim*; Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.2, 2.1, 3.19; P. Oxy. 1380.51; Vanderlip 1972, 94–5; Žabkar 1988, 154–6; Dousa 2002, 175–82; Sfameni Gasparro 2002, 255–325.

⁹⁸ *RICIS* 302/0204.55–6, 202/1801.171–3.

⁹⁹ *LGG* VII.7, 5–6; Kockelmann 2008, 66–7; Dousa 2002, 175–7.

¹⁰⁰ At the most the Moirai obey Isis (*RICIS* 202/1801.172–3); Peek 1930, 74–5.

¹⁰¹ E.g. **10.1**, 5, 30 κύων; **11.58** ἵππος, δράκαινα; **12.25** μελανεΐμων; **14.8** σεμνή; **15.8–9**, 11–14, 48 δασπλήτι, 50, 52 ὀφροπλόκαμε καὶ ζωνοδράκοντι.

and the other instances in which dominion over ‘necessity’ is mentioned (11.5, cf. 10.1) seem all to point in the same direction: Hecate-moon in her triplicity and three phases represents birth, life and death; thus destiny as the cyclical inevitable necessity that leads to the final dissolution (new moon). In these descriptions there is no room for a goddess of good luck, tutelary of the destiny of the community, but only for a goddess of Necessity conceived as a fate of birth and death (lunar phases). Thus it must be concluded that the identification Hecate-‘fate’ in the magical hymns does not seem to imply the same prerequisites as that of Isis-Tyche, but it is based on the functional and iconographical features of a group of divine personifications typical of Greek mythology that do not appear in connection with Isis or among her entourage.

Secondly, we saw that the all-generating and all-ruling aspect can have a double interpretation: the clues pointing towards the Greek side are mainly the chosen expressive patterns that resemble the praising of Aphrodite-Gaea-Nature of earlier hymnography (see 12.27–30, 15.32–6). In fact, Greek aretalogies and hymns normally describe these functions of Isis in different terms: for example, the produce of the earth (καρπός) is frequently mentioned – as could happen with her Egyptian epithets – together with her designation as ‘discoverer’ (εὐρέτρια);¹⁰² or she can be described as the one who created or gave a route to the astral bodies and separated heaven and earth;¹⁰³ Isis is never identified with Nature, and her identification with Aphrodite-Hathor is put in a special connection with her capability of creating love between men

¹⁰² E.g. *RICIS* 114/0202.36; 302/0204.7; 701/0103.12; Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.3, 8, 2.3, 19 (Bernand 1969, 631, no. 175, *ad* 1.3–4); P. Oxy. 1380.81, 185–6; *LGG* (3rd) VIII.17.D.2. Peek 1930, 52–4; Festugière 1949, 229–31; Dousa 2002, 152–6; Kockelmann 2008, 63.

¹⁰³ E.g. *RICIS* 202/1101.12–14; 202/1801.29–33; 302/0204.12–14; 701/0103.16–17; Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.9–10; P. Oxy. 1380.157–8; cf. *LGG* (3rd) VIII.18. E.2.

CONCLUSIONS

and women, and not with a general creative aspect.¹⁰⁴ At the same time, the Egyptian sources, as usual, connect her creative function with her primordially,¹⁰⁵ but in our lunar hymns the primordial aspect is practically non-existent: even the statement that the goddess is the ἀρχή of everything (15.35) could refer to her chthonic aspect or to her connection with the deities of fate, and does not necessarily imply primordially. Nothing in these hymns clearly states that Hecate's creative power is one of primordial creation, of 'creation from nothing' – it is no coincidence that there is no mention, for example, of the creation of astral bodies. Hecate is described as a mere creator of life, on the model of an Earth Mother Goddess and not as creator of the cosmos.

Furthermore, the bull appearance of the goddess in the magical hymns seemed to be especially linked with the generative aspect. Isis in her identification with Hathor could certainly be called 'cow', even if she is never said to be, for example, bull-voiced, but her being a cow and her Hathorian horned crown had solar and celestial associations rather than lunar. If this depiction of Isis was so common, it is quite odd that it almost never appears in hymns and aretalogies, and the only instance in which we find Isis ταυρῶπις¹⁰⁶ specifies that this is the epithet she had at Samothrace, the same place where Hecate, Aphrodite and the Anatolian Mother Goddess seem to have been identified (see 12.27–30). Therefore, it seems more probable that the connection between Hecate and the Aphrodite-bull-generative aspect was fostered by Anatolian influence, since it was especially in these territories that Hecate had a 'Mother Goddess', hence generative, connotation.¹⁰⁷ At the same time, Hecate could have been associated with

¹⁰⁴ E.g. *RICIS* 114/0202.27–8, 41–3; 202/1101.17, 27; 202/1801.37, 102–3; 302/0204.17, 27; cf. P. Oxy. 1380.28, 94, 109, 137, 146–8. Peek 1930, 39–41, 57; Kockelmann 2008, 68.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. *LGG* (3rd) VIII.18.E.1; cf. Dousa 2002, 170–2.

¹⁰⁶ P. Oxy. 1380.107.

¹⁰⁷ See 10.3–5, II n.14; 11.25–44 J σώτειρα, II n.165; 11.59, II n.192.

the bull thanks to the ‘bull horns’-‘moon’ equivalence, a fact that could have promoted her identification with Aphrodite, already connected with this animal in her fertile/sexual aspect and in astrology (see 12 Conclusions). Consequently, if we consider that in Egyptian there are no possible equivalents for our epithets since Isis is simply called ‘cow’, and that bull-descriptions of the Hellenistic Isis are practically non-existent, it seems unlikely that Hecate’s bull appearance was influenced by Egyptian representations of Isis-Hathor.

Finally, regarding the other epithets that can also be found in connection with Isis, two of them, *πελαγίη* and *σώτειρα*, (11.31, 37), appear only in 11.25–44, which does not exactly induce us to consider them as typical of *PGM*’s Hecate.¹⁰⁸ Anyway, they do not have an unequivocal explanation and could fit the goddess without the mediation of Isis. *Κυρία* and *ἄνασσα* (see 10.14, 29, 11.39, 12.38) are too generic to give any secure information, and even the rarer *μεγίστη* (see 14.6) is frequent for Hecate in Asia Minor; *μελανείμων* (see 12.25) is common as a description of the Erinyes. Both *πολύμορφε* (see 14.9, 15.9) and *πολυώνυμε* (see 14.23, 36, 15.20, 31) have Egyptian equivalents,¹⁰⁹ but they also find an easy connection with the lunar Hecate. Moreover, *πολυώνυμε* appears within two hymns that do actually call Hecate by many names,¹¹⁰ and 15.20–2 states ‘therefore they call you Hecate, with many names . . . goddess with four faces, four names’. The passage clarifies that the epithet is specifically used for Hecate’s many forms (phases), while Isis’ polyonymy did not have anything

¹⁰⁸ In particular, any description of her ‘saving activity’ is totally missing, as opposed to Isis’ hymns and aretalogies: e.g. Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.24–34, 2.5–8, 20–2, 3.16–18; P. Oxy 1380.10, 13, 55, 68, 76, 91, 293.

¹⁰⁹ But while the latter is frequent for Isis, the former is much rarer: cf. *RICIS* 501/0154.5–6; P. Oxy.1380.9, 70; Dousa 2002, 168–74.

¹¹⁰ 14: Hecate, Baubo, Artemis, Core-Persephone; 15: Selene, Dike, Clotho, Lachesis, Atropos, Persephone, Megaera, Alecto, Hecate, Mene, Artemis, etc.

CONCLUSIONS

to do with her lunar nature, but with her great renown and her identification with almost all the Mediterranean goddesses.¹¹¹

We can also notice that, while in the solar hymns the Egyptian name Horus is used twice to identify the god invoked, the only instances in which 'Isis' appears in the lunar hymns are very dubious. They all occur in **11** and, as discussed in the commentary, do not show any identification between Hecate-moon and Isis, but present them as separate deities.¹¹² The only case in which Hecate may be identified with an Egyptian deity is **13.28A**, where the goddess is equated with Hermes. Of course the two shared many functions in Greece and could have been associated without any external trigger, but, if 'Hermes' here stood for the Egyptian 'Thoth',¹¹³ it would be very interesting to note that the goddess would be identified with the god of the moon and not with Isis-Hathor, which is quite understandable since the lunar aspect is certainly her predominant feature.¹¹⁴ Reflecting on the Egyptian nature of the magical procedure employed in **13**, one could suppose that the equation Hecate-Hermes/Thoth resulted from this Egyptian background, but, at the same time, in **11**, the other hymn largely employing Egyptian magical practices, the two are separated. Therefore, we must conclude that, even in Egyptian ritual context, the identification Hecate-Thoth was not established but only occasional.

Coming back to Isis-Hathor, none of the possible references to this deity in the lunar hymns is sure enough to confirm that her original features contributed to the divine nature of the goddess invoked. In particular, if Isis was identified with the Hecate of the magical hymns, why do our texts not display many of the attributes and functions that were typical both of the Egyptian and Hellenistic Isis? For example, though both

¹¹¹ Cf. Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.14–24.

¹¹² Even **11.53**, in view of the ambiguity of the passage and the other two instances (**11.47**, 98), can hardly be credited with an Isis-Hecate equation.

¹¹³ Cf. **11.47**.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Hopfner 1974–90, II.1.281–3.

Cronus and Osiris are mentioned in our hymns, Hecate is never said to be the daughter of Geb/Cronus, or the wife/sister of Osiris, and not even the mother of Horus, whereas all these kinships were frequently mentioned both in Egyptian and Greek hymns and aretalogies to Isis.¹¹⁵ Similarly, she is never equated with Sothis/Sirius and there is no mention of her control over the water of rivers and rainfalls.¹¹⁶ Hecate is called 'Dike' twice,¹¹⁷ but the stress on the normative function that was so typical of Greek praises of Isis is totally missing, together with her role of benefactress: she did not institute justice and law, establish sanctuaries and teach men to make and honour the statues of the gods, she did not reveal the mysteries or make children respect their parents.¹¹⁸ Moreover, though having become a lunar goddess too, Isis usually retained a connection with the solar god, as when she is said to take part in the course of the sun, which reflects the Egyptian tradition that imagined her as accompanying the sun god during his journey on his bark.¹¹⁹ However, this aspect is also missing. Another surprisingly missing function is her role in the invention of writing and division of the different tongues, so often stressed in Greek praises¹²⁰ and also present in Egyptian in the titles describing

¹¹⁵ E.g. *RICIS* 114.0202.16; 202/1101.5–6, 21; 202/1801.15–16; 302/0204.5–6, 8, 21; Isidorus, *Hym.* 2.13–14; P. Oxy. 1380.186–9, 209–14, 242–3, 246–7, 250–2, 263–8. Peek 1930, 34–6; Žabkar 1988, e.g. 23–5, 31, 52–3 nos. 1, 2, 4; Kockelmann 2008, 50–1.

¹¹⁶ E.g. *RICIS* 202/1101.9; 202/1801.23; 302/0204.9, 39, 43, 54; Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.11–13, 2.17–18; P. Oxy. 1380.121–3, 125–6, 144, 223–30; cf. *LGG* (3st) VIII.3.A.4, 4.A.6, 14.B.5; Kockelmann 2008, 59–62; Dousa 2002, 154–6; Žabkar 1988, 51.

¹¹⁷ 15.7, 50, but see 15.7–8.

¹¹⁸ E.g. *RICIS* 114/0202.24–6, 29–34; 202/1101.4, 19–34; 202/1801.13–14, 36, 93–7; 302/0204.4, 16, 19–38, 52; Isidorus, *Hym.* 1.5–6, 3.24, 4.4 (Bernand 1969, 631, no. 175, *ad loc.*); P. Oxy. 1380.119–20, 139–42, 202–5, 244–5; cf. Kockelmann 2008, 63–8.

¹¹⁹ E.g. *RICIS* 202/1801.138–40; 302/0204.44–5; Isidorus, *Hym.* 3.25–7; P. Oxy. 1380.112, 157–9; Žabkar 1988, 90–1, 108, 120. Cf. **II** n.155.

¹²⁰ E.g. *RICIS* 202/1101.3c, 31; 202/1801.10–12, 112; 114/0202.22–4, 26–8; 302/0204.3b–3c, 31; 701/0103.10–11; P. Oxy. 1380.27, 48, 123–4.

CONCLUSIONS

her as wise goddess, ‘mistress of writing’, ‘excellent in writing’, ‘with effective speech’, ‘mistress of the divine words’ (meaning also ‘script’).¹²¹

Furthermore, our hymns have a taste for animal images: apart from the cow, Isis in Egypt could be identified with the lion (as solar-royal symbol) and the snake/cobra (as primordial/solar-royal-uraeus symbol),¹²² but never with the wolf or the mare, which appear frequently in our hymns (see **11.25–44** **Ε** λυκώ, 58–9, **12.24**, **15.19**); at the same time Hecate in the magical hymns is never identified with any of Isis’ other traditional animal symbols which can also appear in Greek sources, such as the vulture, the hippopotamus, the scorpion, the hawk and the kite,¹²³ all animals that do not hold any special role in Greek religion. This seems to confirm that the animal symbols of Hecate stick to the Greek imagery and, even when it would seem more probable (for example, the bull), do not imply an identification Hecate-Isis. Another unexpected omission is the reference to the magical power of the goddess, which would have perfectly fitted the context. For in Egypt Isis was often referred to as the ‘great of magic’, ‘the one with effective/excellent magical power’, ‘mistress of magic’.¹²⁴

In conclusion, the apparent coexistence of Isiac and Hecatean attributes and functions must be discarded since the Isiac contribution is not sufficiently supported by internal and comparative evidence. No doubt the choice of some epithets

¹²¹ *LGG* (3st) VIII.19–20.G.1.

¹²² Here e.g. see **11.59**, **10.5**, **11.58** δράκαινα (cf. 5.1).

¹²³ *LGG* (3st) VIII.16.C.1. E.g. P. Oxy. 1380.66 (γυπόμορφος), 219–20. Many of these animal symbols were attributed to Isis thanks to her identification with other Egyptian goddesses such as Selqet, Opet, Thoris: see Dunand 1973b, 11–20; cf. Žabkar 1988, 109–10; cf. Smelik and Hemelrijk 1984, 1861–3.

¹²⁴ *Wrt-hk3w* (*LGG* II.493–6, Funktionen A.a), *mnht-hk3w* (*LGG* III.314), *nbt-hk3w* (*LGG* IV.109, Funktionen A.a, B.a); cf. *LGG* (3st) VIII.19.G.1, 45.X; Žabkar 1988, no. 8.

was influenced by Isis' titles and praises exactly as some lexical patterns in the hymns to the solar god are paralleled in Isiac aretalogies and hymns.¹²⁵ However, as far as the nature of divinity is concerned, these epithets are all justifiable also in connection with Hecate, and the other aspects that were typical of the Egyptian/Hellenistic Isis, and not justifiable in connection with Hecate, are missing. Therefore, though it is possible to admit the lexical influence of the Isiac praises, it is very hard to maintain that the divine personas of Isis and Hecate were identified or merged into a 'new' divinity. The female lunar deity of our hymns is mainly 'dark', chthonic and lunar; she is certainly identified with a range of Greek goddesses and often displays attributes that could derive from the female deities worshipped in the Anatolian territories within the Greek sphere of influence (where Hecate was especially venerated), but does not present any incontrovertible trace of Egyptian influence.

Apart from the nature of the deity invoked, another element in favour of this hypothesis is the adherence to Greek mythological imagery. As opposed to the solar, the lunar hymns often involve multiple divine entities that are exclusive to Greek religious tradition: first the Erinyes (and their personal names) with their snake-haired iconography; the Moirai called by their personal names; Peitho, Physis and the Charites (12.22, 15.33, 4); and a certain erudite flavour seems to underlie the mentions of Baubo and Alcyone (see 14.2, 11.30). Other deities, who had been given an Egyptian equivalent, are called by their Greek names and, whenever it is possible to find some mythological allusions, seem to hold their traditional functions: Cerberus is the doorkeeper of the Underworld (11.20–1, 50, 15.51), which does not totally fit his equivalent Anubis, who had much more extended functions; Pan is mentioned for his affair with Selene (13.19) and does not seem to be connected with his equivalent, Min; Cronus was sometimes equated with Atum or Geb, but our hymns refer both to the

¹²⁵ See I n.188, n.459, n.534, n.543 and n.547.

CONCLUSIONS

Greek myth of his defeat by Zeus and to his identification with Chronus, 'Time' (see **11.68–73**, **83**, **15.38**). Also, the Underworld depicted is totally Greek: we find a mention of Erebus (**15.49**), and Tartarus – the deeper section of the Underworld meant for the sinners and their punishment – appears frequently (**10.4**, **11.20**, **94**, **12.12** or in the epithet **ταρταροῦχος**, **11.1**, **50**, **82**, **91**); there are no solar gods traversing the realm of the dead; there are doors – but not the ambiguous 'doors of the Styx' (see **3.28**) – and the river Lethe (**12.11–12**).¹²⁶

As often observed, the only elements that can be ascribed with certainty to an Egyptian environment are the magical procedures in **11** and **13**, even if **11** also employs some Greek conceptions and techniques (such as the use of the **ρόμβος**; see Conclusions *ad loc.*). However, the deity invoked by the lunar hymns is the Hellenistic Hecate occasionally provided with a universal generative function according to her chthonic nature and to the traits that were typical of her Anatolian worship. In the Commentary we saw that other attributes could also have an Anatolian background, which becomes particularly interesting considering that Anatolia is regarded as the more probable setting for the composition of the *OH*, with which the lunar hymns share so much of their vocabulary.¹²⁷

For the sake of comparison, it should be remembered that most divine attributes described in our hymns can be found together in the four *OH* to Hecate, Selene, Persephone and Artemis.¹²⁸ Moreover, **11.90–1** seems to have originally belonged to the *legomena* of one of the Greek mystery cults (see

¹²⁶ On the appearance in the *PGM* of Underworld features and of deities who did not have a proper cult in Greek religion see Johnston, forthcoming.

¹²⁷ See **Intro.** n.85; Guthrie 1930; Morand 2001, 194–7; cf. the famous remarks of Plato, *Resp.* 364b–c (cf. **Intro.** p. 17, Theophr. *Char.* 16.11–11a), associating 'Orphic initiators' with magical practice: Guthrie 1993, 17, 202; Tortorelli Ghidini 2000; Così 2000; Ogden 2001, 105–6, 116–27. Cf. also the magical object from Pergamon (**II** n.34); Mastrocinque 2002, 180–1; Gordon 2002, 197–8.

¹²⁸ *Hym.* 1, 9, 29, 36.

Commentary *ad loc.*). In terms of both content and style, these hymns seem to have been reworked starting from cultic/ritual praises of Greek chthonic deities possibly connected with the Anatolian worship of Mother-chthonic-lunar Goddesses.

The Egyptian background of the hymns' compilers

Considering the stylistic and conceptual variations between the different groups of hymns, it seemed logical to hypothesize different cultural provenances or inspirations, at least for their earlier stages of composition. The solar hymns could have been written by Egyptian (off-duty) priests trying to render, with the aid of various sources, the divine nature of their solar-creator god; the Apollonian hymns could derive from the Greek cultic sphere of oracular consultation; the lunar hymns could have been composed directly in a Greek (10, 14) or mixed (11, 13) magical milieu under the influence of a possibly Anatolian worship of Hecate (12, 15). However, apart from the cultural background in which they were originally written, in what background were they readapted or chosen to fit the magical context of *PGM*?

Let us assume that the Egyptian solar-creator god, the Hellenistic Hecate and Apollo all had a special role in magic or prophecy in their own cultural settings, and thus, owing to a certain conservatism of magic and ritual practice, there was possibly no reason to add to their functions and attributes any 'foreign' element. Such an interpretation would explain the separation and consistency of the divine figures described by the different groups of hymns: their praises would have been chosen only as magically/prophetically renowned and inserted into the spells without interfering with the nature of divinity expressed by them. Now, this is somewhat true, but it creates problems as far as the expressive patterns of the solar hymns are concerned, since they make a free, abundant use of Greek, Judaeo-Christian and Egyptian sources. It has been noticed

CONCLUSIONS

that this choice could be motivated by the necessity of finding Greek expressive patterns for Egyptian ideas, which is only partly true. In fact, some of the 'more Egyptian' sections do not display the use of any 'foreign' source but seem to have been directly written in Greek (e.g. see 1.32-7, 5.3-5). At the same time, if it had been only the expressive pattern that was needed, one could have inserted, for example, *δέσποτα κόσμου* or *ἀκάματον πῦρ* but avoided mentioning Adonai or Helios.

The second reason behind the choice of this cultural jumble has been suggested to be the authors' attempt to adapt unfamiliar contents for a Hellenized 'audience'. Even in this case, it can be only partly true, since for example the different appellatives of the Jewish God, the names of archangels, of Gnostic archons, or the allusions to the Gnostic *πνεῦμα*, though common in a particular milieu, were not widespread in Hellenistic religion. Of course the names were frequently used as *voces magicae*, but in these hymns they are integrated into the text, as opposed to the lunar and Apollonian hymns, in which the rare instances of Jewish words appear only within strings of *voces magicae* and do not include archangels or Gnostic archons. This means that the reader of a solar hymn could have hardly dismissed them as a series of *voces magicae* of different origin added just because powerful in themselves, but would have had to consider them in connection with the deity. Therefore, if the solar hymns were targeting a Hellenized 'audience', these elements would have appeared a little obscure. At the same time, if they were targeting a Judaeo-Christian or Gnostic 'audience', mentions of the golden-haired Helios and Apollo would have been useless, and perhaps displeasing.

The likelier possibility would be to consider this cultural amalgam more specifically as typical of the magical milieu, so the hymns would have been targeted at 'Hellenized magicians', regardless of their clients. These ritual specialists appreciated this kind of cultural variety in the choice of divine names and epithets since they thought it was capable of

increasing the power of spells. However, if this cultural mixture in the description of gods was so typical of magical milieus, why is it practically absent from the lunar and Apollonian hymns? They could have called Apollo 'Horus', or Hecate 'Isis', and being just a name it would not have disrupted the coherence of their divine nature. At the same time, if mixing different cultural elements was considered important to extend the power of the invocation, why did this amalgam not eventually alter the divine nature and create a deity actually syncretistic in functions and iconography?

The last question is easily answered: because the compilers of the extant solar hymns did not aim at merging different deities, but at describing one deity: the Egyptian solar-creator god. While doing this they drew material from different sources, partly because they were looking for expressive patterns and because they wanted to make the composition appealing to a wide 'audience', but mainly because, according to customary practice in magical literature, whenever possible, adding authoritative foreign elements would have given more power to the invocation. There is only one prerequisite for freely moving among the sources, selecting elements that could serve the purpose, adding and reworking sections, all this without losing general consistency with the divine features: being well acquainted with the divinity to be described. For someone having a deep knowledge of the nature of the Egyptian solar-creator god it would have been easy to recognize comparable functions and attributes in different contexts. For example, Apollo could have been added owing to his oracular function even if his other traditional attributes did not have much to do with the Egyptian solar god. Again, sections rich in Judaeo-Christian elements could have been added and reworked since the deity behind the various angelic/mediating entities was a supreme-creator god, but when the passages were pasted into the new context the separation between the deity and his intermediaries became vague.

CONCLUSIONS

We would expect a similar process to have been adopted for the Apollonian and lunar hymns too, but this does not appear to be the case. Neither the nature of the deities nor the expressive patterns chosen to convey it show any specifically Egyptian or Judaeo-Christian influence, the only exception being the magical procedures of **11** and **13** and a few *voces magicae* within detachable strings. For example, when in **7.13** Apollo is equated with Helios instead of *κοίρανε κόσμου* there could have been *δέσποτα κόσμου* and perhaps an added element such as 'Adonai' since in this function of absolute ruler Helios could have been comparable to the Jewish God; he could also have been called 'Horus' owing to the shared solar function. On the other hand, the lunar hymns could also have used typical Judaeo-Christian patterns when describing the goddess as the mistress of the cosmos (**13.21**, **15.35**); moreover, among the 'many names', they could have called the deity 'Hathor', as Aphrodite, or 'Isis', for example as queen of the Underworld. Owing to her lunar nature or to her role as magician *par excellence*, she could have obtained the epithets 'great of magic', or 'mistress of magic', typical both of the magician and lunar Thoth and of the sorceress Isis, and so on (see **Intro.** pp. 9–10, **Concl.** n.124, cf. **11.46–7**).

The absence of this culturally varied contribution suggests that the last stages of transmission of these hymns occurred in an Egyptian cultural environment in which the divine nature of Apollo and Hecate, even if understood, was perceived as alien to the traditional pantheon: the compilers seem to have had difficulties in identifying Egyptian equivalents for these deities and thus in syncretising them with their own. Otherwise, it would be hard to explain why simple features such as those listed above could not have been added. One could say that, since these hymns were stemming from a specific cultural environment they were not touched in order to avoid disrupting the efficacy of the spell. But if this had been customary practice, the solar hymns would be inconceivable since they should have stuck to their 'Egyptian sections' without adding

any foreign element (an example could have been 5 omitting the Homeric line 2). Of course the conservative attitude of magic manifests itself in the preservation of standard formulae, but addition has never been forbidden, as demonstrated by the whole *PGM* corpus, starting from the use of *voces magicae*. At the same time, if the hymns had to be kept as they were, why do we find Egyptian magical procedures in 11 and 13?

In fact, what did not undergo any specific Egyptian additions are not these hymns per se, but the descriptions of the deities invoked. The compilers could have reworked the texts, but, since they did not recognize the deities as comparable to their own, preferred to avoid additions that could have been inappropriate. The superimpositions were limited to those components that did not interfere with the nature of divinity, i.e. magical procedures and strings of *voces magicae*.

To give a hypothetical example, if a compiler with an Egyptian cultural background wants to praise the Egyptian solar-creator god and happens to know from Greek sources that Apollo is also renowned for his oracular function and often has solar features, he can then realize that the two gods are comparable in this respect and decide to add Apollo to his praise in order to enhance the coverage of the deity with an authoritative foreign element, and thus to increase the power of the invocation. However, if the same compiler finds himself confronted with a hymn describing Apollo-Helios as an archer, lord of song, in armour, riding the chariot of the sun, and taking part in a mythical episode in which Daphne-laurel is involved, he would realize that, when described in a wider range of functions, Apollo is very difficult to compare with his solar-creator god, and he would probably not feel at ease with adding Egyptian attributes to a deity that, as a whole, would seem unsuitable for them. On the contrary, if a compiler with a Greek cultural background wants to praise Apollo-Helios starting from these same features and happens to know from Egyptian sources that the Egyptian solar god is described as traversing the sky on a bark, he can

CONCLUSIONS

consider the two journeys comparable and decide to add ‘Re’ as an authoritative foreign element for his invocation. But the same compiler faced by a hymn such as 5 describing the god as serpent, lion, origins of fire, sweet lotus, scarab, self-engendered and making mild foam gush forth from pure mouths, would find it very difficult to compare this deity with his Helios, and would probably not feel at ease even with adding a phrase such as ὃς πάντ’ ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ’ ἐπακούει, which would fit the nature of the deity.

The conclusion is always the same: freedom of addition and re-elaboration implies a deep knowledge of the material we want to change more than of the material we want to add. Furthermore, this general attitude must have been even more relevant when dealing with metrical compositions since their poetical form provided them with greater sacredness and thus with less room for inappropriate interferences. Therefore, we must conclude that the absence of intercultural equivalences in the Apollonian and lunar hymns is likely to be due to the Egyptian environment in which they were copied in the last stages of their transmission. The only instance, though very dubious, that might represent an added Egyptian feature is the identification of Hecate and Hermes (13.28A and above p. 374). Interestingly enough, it occurs in the hymn with the shorter praising section, in which the divine attributes are reduced to a minimum and do not even include such features as Hecate’s iconography, her role in the Underworld or at the crossroads, or her identification with Artemis. In this less detailed context, Hecate and Thoth could have been actually comparable as lunar deities, which was very difficult when they are described in the whole of their functions, exactly as it was problematic to compare Hecate with the Egyptian – not yet Hellenized – Isis.

The analysis of the religious conceptions and their patterns of expression in the magical hymns would thus confirm the hypothesis that the extant *PGM* were assembled within an Egyptian priestly milieu and that the compilers, in spite of

the availability of Greek sources, were not particularly versed in Greek religious tradition. The scant attestations of Apollo and Hecate in the rest of the corpus and the appearance of the lunar hymns in only one papyrus also point to the same conclusion. Of course, these results are limited to what we can infer from the treatment of religious conceptions and their interaction in the magical hymns, and thus cannot be used to draw a definitive general conclusion on the location of production of the *PGM* corpus. In fact, to identify with more certainty the cultural background of the compilers of the *PGM* would also require a detailed analysis of their scribal techniques, applying the tools of textual criticism to the whole corpus. Following this approach as far as the hymns are concerned, they could have been discussed considering, for instance, which version might have been the original one, and thus which kind of scribal mistakes or changes had been made, and if these mistakes or changes could have been attributed to a Greek or Egyptian linguistic attitude. However, this kind of analysis somehow implies the reconstruction of an archetype, which I specifically wanted to avoid (cf. pp. 28, 38). In fact, the aim of this study is to find out what these hymns can tell us about the nature of divinity if we concentrate on the conceptions they express and the language they choose to express them, in order to determine both the original cultural background of the deities addressed and their reception in the magical hymns as we have them. In conclusion, the different divine natures, and their different treatment, suggest a specific 'mental attitude' towards particular religious conceptions that can be traced back to an Egyptian cultural background. Hopefully other studies, dealing with the whole corpus of the *PGM* or with other aspects (such as the spells' organization in the single papyri, scribal techniques, layout of texts, ritual practices and so on), may use these specific conclusions to complement their own, and eventually arrive at an ultimate answer to the problem of the location of production of the *PGM*.

CONCLUSIONS

THE INTERACTION OF RELIGION, THE SECLUSION OF MAGIC

Apart from intercultural contributions or equivalences, it has been often stressed that the nature of the deities described by the magical hymns does not display any syncretistic trend. It is time to add some final considerations that will also clarify the reason why a deity such as Hecate must have been perceived as alien to Egyptian religious thought. Among other possible reasons, the Egyptian landscape did not permit the formation of imagery in which the earth is the feminine fertile element connected with the vegetative cycle, since in the absence of water nothing would have sprung from the desert land. The receptive/passive earth was sterile without the creative/active water, thus it was the masculine liquid element/semen that had to be entrusted with the fertility underlying the vegetative cycle. For this reason, in Egyptian religion all the main chthonic-lunar gods were male and easily associable with the sun since it was its cyclicity that embodied the principle of regeneration *par excellence*. The moon was the left eye of the sun god and not his dark counterpart, exactly as Thoth, though playing a role in the Netherworld, as 'secretary' of Re at the side of the sun god, could hardly be considered a chthonic god. The association between fertility-regeneration-moon and earth-feminine was practically non-existent, as was the mental association female-darkness-indistinctness, since it implies the equation of the maternal womb with the earth as the seat of fertility.¹²⁹ Therefore, a chthonic, Underworld, lunar, female deity such as Hecate was inconceivable in Egyptian imagery.

At the same time, the connection of magic with chthonic-dark-feminine powers, so typical of Greek thought,¹³⁰ was also

¹²⁹ Frankfort 1958, 173–5; Roth 2000; Te Velde 1977. Cf. Baines 1985, especially 83–122; Von Lieven 2007, 194. On the symbolism water/fertility cf. also Assmann 2003.

¹³⁰ It would be sufficient to remember that all the great literary magicians were female, or to recall the fame of Thessalian witches and how chthonic

absent in Egypt. Of course Isis was a great magician, and she played an important role in the Netherworld as consort and resuscitator of Osiris, and among her functions she was also in charge of women's fertility. However, she was involved in fertility and resurrection as mother *par excellence*, being the mother of king Horus, but this motherhood was not associated with the chthonic element since the connection earth-fertility was missing. She was mainly a sky goddess linked to royalty with solar and astral (Sothis/Sirius) traits, but not lunar ones, and her magical power did not have anything to do with chthonic or feminine forces – it is no coincidence that the other great magician of the Egyptian pantheon, Thoth, is male (**Concl.** n.124, cf. **11.46–7**, **Intro.** pp. 9–10).

Without getting into the long-standing problem of the proper definition of magic, it is possible to recall a general statement, which, regardless of specific theories, seems to be generally true: magic links different entities through sympathetic laws since it implies that saying (formulae/invocations) or doing (ritual) something will make something else happen.¹³¹ The nature of this interconnection can be influenced by theological conceptions. In Egyptian religion, many gods not only preside over the cosmic elements but 'are' the cosmic elements (e.g. Re is the sun), a conception which, together with the henotheistic trend inherent in the possibility of considering the single deities as manifestations of one and the same power, had always been influential until it reached the all-inclusive transcendent Amun-Re and his cosmic connotations.¹³² When god 'is' the world, the force that potentially links all the cosmic elements together is not only considered divine, but can also embody a creative

deities are so often invoked in magical procedures. Of course other deities can be involved with magic if they have a specific competence, for example Aphrodite teaching Jason erotic magic, but these examples better fit the 'divine gift to men' category than magical procedure.

¹³¹ Cf. Hopfner 1974–90, I.198–226 specifically on the *PGM*. Cf. **Intro.** p. 8.

¹³² See **Intro.** pp. 41–2 and n.119, pp. 46, 51–2 and n.151.

CONCLUSIONS

power, as happened in Egypt with the god Heka, the personification of magic who, according to different cosmogonies, took part in the creation of the universe.¹³³ When god 'is' the world, magic can be the positive divine connective that holds together the whole cosmos in a conception where 'saying' is not different from 'being' and 'speech' is equated to 'reality'. In the Greek post-Titanic pantheon, the identification with cosmic elements was usually reserved to minor deities with a scant mythology, but what was really missing was a henotheistic trend comparable to the Egyptian together with the idea of one universal creator to whom the origin of everything in the universe could be traced back (see **Intro.** p. 46). Therefore, Greek religion never developed the conception of a cosmic god, which was possible only within some specific philosophical speculations. When god 'is not' the universe, a force that links together different elements in the world regardless of a direct divine intervention cannot be considered positively divine. However, it is still present and cannot even be purely human; hence the frequent connection of magic with demonic forces and its negative and certainly not creative connotations. When god 'is not' the world, magic appears to lie outside the bright clarity of cosmic order and thus has to be attributed to the dark indistinctness of the mental realm of disorder: for example, barbarian lands and people (such as Medea from Colchis, the Persian *magoi*, the Egyptian priest), Underworld, female and chthonic principles.¹³⁴ Therefore, not only the goddess Hecate but also her connection with magic were totally alien to Egyptian tradition.

In spite of the theological incompatibility female-chthonic-lunar/male-chthonic-lunar, we know that in Graeco-Roman religion an actual syncretism was sometimes possible, the best example being the couple Isis-Sarapis (see **Intro.** pp. 8-10). Indeed, the Hellenistic Isis preserved many of her original

¹³³ See **Intro.** pp. 17-18.

¹³⁴ See **Intro.** pp. 16-17 and n.42. Cf. also Ray 1981, 178.

characteristics, and often her all-including power of attraction seems to be the result of a general trend towards the simplification of the pantheon into two main deities, one male and one female. However, there were also some new contributions to her nature, such as the very addition of lunar and chthonic (earth-fertility related) qualities (Demeter equivalence), which she obtained mainly from the reinterpretation of her astral and motherly attributes (see **Intro.** pp. 9–10, **12.23**). At the same time, the nature of Sarapis was basically that of Osiris in his identification with Amun-Re – note Sarapis’ strong connection with fertility in accordance with the above-mentioned Egyptian conceptions – but, apart from his identification with Hades, Zeus and Helios, even his Greek iconography would suffice to define him as a syncretistic deity. Even if we accept that his worship was ‘politically’ promoted by the Ptolemies, he still testifies together with Isis to the actual possibility of consistently unifying deities with originally different or apparently incompatible competences and attributes.

Coming back to our hymns, the deities can be called by different names, but their divine persona does not display any syncretistic tendency. The solar male god might have been Sarapis since he shared his functions with Amun-Re, but the total absence of a Zeus/Hades identification and of the iconographical features typical of this deity makes clear that we are not dealing with the Graeco-Roman Sarapis. The god of the Apollonian hymns is simply the traditional Apollo, at most described in his classical identification with Helios. The lunar female goddess is neither the Egyptian/Hellenistic Isis nor a syncretistic Hecate-Isis but only the Hellenistic Hecate. In theory, nothing would have impeded the composition of syncretistic hymns to such deities as Amun-Re-Sarapis and Hecate-Isis: for example, the solar hymns could have added just more iconographical features, insisted on the god’s involvement in the production of the fruits of the earth, and also called the god Zeus; the lunar hymns could have kept the dark chthonic traits of the Greek Hecate, but added, for example,

CONCLUSIONS

an allusion to the resurrection of Osiris, or some specific Isiac titles such as those referring to writing, speech and magic.

There is one case in the magical hymns that seems to attest this kind of coexistence of the two religious traditions: the three versions of a hymn to Hermes which collects attributes and functions of both the Greek god and the Egyptian Thoth.¹³⁵ But the reason behind this apparent syncretism is that the two divine natures were already overlapping to a very large extent. They originally shared the majority of their functions, and thus adding an epithet or an iconographical feature exclusive of one or the other became very easy since the two were mainly conceived as the same deity. Only in this case the original nature of one god was widened or slightly modified thanks to the contribution of the other, but clearly on the basis of an inherent identity.

However, when this original superimposition was missing, the magical hymns analysed above, whether stemming from a Greek, Egyptian or mixed background, do not show any effort to create a 'new' Graeco-Egyptian divinity at any stage of their composition. The magical hymns represent two separate traditions of hymnody and religious imagery: one stemming from a Greek cultural background and associated with cultic/ritual Greek hymns, mostly in hexameters, addressing Greek divine personas; the other originating in an Egyptian cultural background and associated with Egyptian praises to the supreme creator god which from the Ramessid theology of Amun-Re had also reached the Ptolemaic period through magical literature and the development of polymorphic deities (see **Intro.** pp. 47–50). It is impossible to know exactly when the two traditions merged in magical literature and when, for example, someone decided to write a hymn adapting Hecate's divine persona to Egyptian magical procedures (**II**, **13**). Considering the lexical similarities with the *OH* and

¹³⁵ See **Intro.** n.73; Hopfner 1974–90, II.1.277–80; Heitsch 1959, 223–36. Cf. Derchain-Urtel 1981, 136–46.

the penetration of Judaeo-Christian jargon, the combination could have happened around the first/second century AD, but the single traditions must have had a longer, autonomous history of transmission. What seems certain is that the compilers, at least at a certain stage, must have had access to both cultic/ritual Greek hymns and magico-religious Egyptian praises, which points towards an Egyptian priestly milieu since such documents could be collected together in temple libraries. Even incantations addressed to deities that seem to have been alien to the last redactors were copied and preserved as powerful in themselves; this, as well as the existence of 'mixed' hymns (11, 13) and the strong Hellenization of the solar hymns, testifies not only to a great taste for collecting but also to the will of addressing Hellenized ritual specialists and clients. However, as far as the nature of divinity is concerned, in spite of the first general impression, there is no real sign of mutual religious influence. The magical hymns as we have them seem thus to fit in that process of 'assimilation and resistance'¹³⁶ in which the Egyptian priestly 'upper class', with the progressive weakening of its prestige, tried to promote traditional beliefs and rituals by re-adapting them according to the expectations of the Hellenized ruling class (see **Intro.** p. 19). The analysis of divinity in the magical hymns, despite the apparent syncretism of the corpus, reflects the general image of Graeco-Roman Egypt, a society in which, despite the formal Hellenization and multicultural interaction, the two cultures very rarely actually merged but more often coexisted (see **Intro.**, 'Greeks and Egyptians in Graeco-Roman Egypt and the survival of indigenous religious tradition: an outline'). It would be interesting to extend a similar kind of analysis to the whole *PGM* corpus to find out whether this absence of syncretism involves only the magical hymns, or can be considered as distinctive of the extant Graeco-Egyptian magical literature.

¹³⁶ That Frankfurter analysed with reference to the *PGM*, see **Intro.** n.50.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the magical hymns do not feel any urge to escape the indigenousest of the divine nature of their deities; on the contrary, they succeed in maintaining its consistency even when employing different cultural contributions to describe it. In the last stages of transmission, had the compilers been involved in the religious trend that tried to overcome the essential incompatibilities between Greek and Egyptian divinity (see **Intro.** pp. 8–10) it would have probably been natural for them to syncretise different deities. However, not only did they not do this, but they did not even add ‘foreign’ contributions to Apollo and Hecate without altering their nature, which suggests that, in their religious environment, the impasse of the Greek–Egyptian divine incompatibilities was far from being resolved. The deities of the magical hymns stick to their original cultural background, confirming not only the well-known seclusive nature of magic, but also that this seclusive nature made magical literature a privileged field for the preservation of religious traditions that, between the Graeco-Roman cosmopolitan approach and the rise of Christianity, were becoming increasingly indistinct.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Addey, C. (2011) 'Assuming the mantle of the gods: "unknowable names" and invocations in late antique theurgic ritual', in Lardinois, Blok and Van der Poel (eds.) 2011, 279–94.
- Algra, K. (2009) 'Stoic philosophical theology and Graeco-Roman religion', in Salles (ed.) 2009b, 224–51.
- Allen, J. P. (2000) *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*, Cambridge.
- (2005) *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, Writings from the Ancient World 23, Atlanta.
- Alliot, M. (1949) *Le culte d'Horus à Edfou au temps des Ptolémées*, BdÉ 20, Cairo.
- Aloni, A. (1980) "'Prooimia", "Hymnoi", Elio Aristide e i cugini bastardi", *QUCC* NS 4, 23–40.
- Amandry, P. (1950) *La Mantique apollinienne à Delphes: essai sur le fonctionnement de l'Oracle*, Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 170, Paris.
- Ankarloo, B. and Clark, S. (eds.) (1999) *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*, Philadelphia.
- Anthes, R. (1955) 'Zum Ursprung des Nefertem', *ŽĀS* 80, 81–9.
- (1957) 'Atum, Nefertem und die Kosmogonien von Heliopolis: ein Versuch', *ŽĀS* 82, 1–8.
- Asirvatham, S. R., Pache, C. O. and Watrous, J. (eds.) (2001) *Between Magic and Religion: Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and Society*, Lanham.
- Asmis, E. (1982) 'Lucretius' Venus and Stoic Zeus', *Hermes* 110, 458–70.
- Assmann, J. (1969) *Liturgische Lieder an den Sonnengott: Untersuchungen zur altägyptischen Hymnik*, Berlin.
- (1970) *Der König als Sonnenpriester: ein kosmographischer Begleittext zur kultischen Sonnenhymnik in thebanischen Tempeln und Gräbern*, Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo: Ägyptologische Reihe 7, Glückstadt.
- (1975) *Ägyptische Hymnen und Gebete*, Zurich.
- (1979) 'Primat und Transzendenz: Struktur und Genese der ägyptischen Vorstellung eines höchsten Wesens', in W. Westendorf (ed.), *Aspekte der spätägyptischen Religion*, Wiesbaden, 7–42.
- (1983) *Sonnenhymnen in thebanischen Gräbern*, Mainz.
- (1992) 'When justice fails: jurisdiction and imprecation in Ancient Egypt and the Near East', *JEA* 78, 149–62.
- (1995) *Egyptian Solar Religion in the New Kingdom: Re, Amun and the Crisis of Polytheism*, London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1996) 'Verkünden und Verklären: Grundformen hymnischer Rede im alten Ägypten', in Loprieno (ed.) 1996, 313–34.
- (1997a) *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*, Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- (1997b) 'Magic and theology in Ancient Egypt', in Schäfer and Kippenberg (eds.) 1997, 1–18.
- (2001a) *The Search for God in Ancient Egypt*, Ithaca, N.Y. and London.
- (2001b) *Tot und Jenseits im Alten Ägypten*, Munich.
- (2003) 'Das Leichensekret des Osiris: zur kultischen Bedeutung des Wassers im alten Ägypten', in N. Grimal, A. Kamel and C.-M. Sheikholeslami (eds.), *Hommages à Fayza Haikal*, BdÉ 138, Cairo, 5–16.
- Atiya, A. S. (ed.) (1991) *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, New York.
- Audollent, A. (1904) *Defixionum tabellae: quotquot innotuerunt tam in Graecis orientis quam in totius occidentis partibus praeter Atticas in corpore inscriptionum Atticarum editas*, Paris.
- Aufrère, S. (2000) *Le propylône d'Amon-Rê-Montou à Karnak-Nord*, MIFAO 117, Cairo.
- Bagatti, B. (1971) 'Altre medaglie di Salomone cavaliere e la loro origine', *Rivista di archeologia Cristiana* 47, 331–442.
- Bagnall, R. S. (1993) *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, Princeton
- (1997) 'The people of Roman Fayum', in M. L. Bierbrier (ed.), *Portraits and Masks: Burial Customs in Roman Egypt*, London, 7–15.
- (ed.) (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, Oxford.
- Baines, J. (1983) 'Literacy and ancient Egyptian society', *Man* ns 18.3, 572–99.
- (1985) *Fecundity Figures: Egyptian Personification and the Iconology of a Genre*, Chicago.
- (1991) 'Society, morality, and religious practice', in Shafer (ed.) 1991, 123–200.
- (1994) 'King, temple, and cosmos: an earlier model for framing columns in temple scenes of the Graeco-Roman period', in M. Minas and J. Zeidler (eds.), *Aspekte spätägyptischer Kultur: Festschrift für Erich Winter zum 65. Geburtstag*, Aegyptiaca Treverensia 7, Mainz, 23–33.
- (1996) 'Myth and literature', in Loprieno (ed.) 1996, 361–78.
- Bakir, A. el-M. (1943) 'A hymn to Amon-Re at Tura', *ASAE* 42, 83–91.
- Bakowska, G. (2001) 'Bes Pantheos: some remarks concerning his representation on magical gems', in J. Popielska-Grzybowska (ed.), *Proceedings of the First Central European Conference of Young Egyptologists: Egypt 1999: Perspectives of Research, Warsaw 7–9 June 1999*, Światowit: Supplement series E, Egyptology 1, Warsaw Egyptological Studies 3, Warsaw, 11–14.
- Barton, T. (1994) *Ancient Astrology*, London.
- Barucq, A. (1962) *L'expression de la louange divine et de la prière dans la Bible et en Égypte*, BdÉ 33, Cairo.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barucq, A. and Daumas, F. (1980) *Hymnes et prières de l'Égypte ancienne*, Paris.
- Beck, H., Bol, P. C. and Bückling, M. (eds.) (2005) *Ägypten – Griechenland – Rom, Abwehr und Berührung: Städtisches Kunstinstitut und Städtische Galerie*, 26. November 2005–26. Februar 2006, Frankfurt.
- Bedier, S. (1995) *Die Rolle des Gottes Geb in den ägyptischen Tempelinschriften der griechisch-römischen Zeit*, HÄB 41, Hildesheim.
- Bell, H. I., Nock, A. D. and Thompson, H. (eds.) (1933) *Magical Texts from a Bilingual Papyrus in the British Museum*, London.
- Berg, W. (1974) 'Hecate: Greek or "Anatolian"?', *Numen* 21, 128–40.
- Bergman, J. (1968) *Ich bin Isis: Studien zum memphitischen Hintergrund der griechischen Isisaretologien*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia religionum 3, Uppsala.
- (1982) 'Ancient Egyptian theogony in a Greek magical papyrus (PGM VII, ll. 516–521)', in van Voss et al. (eds.) 1982, 28–37.
- Berlandini, J. (1993) 'L'acéphale et le rituel de revirilisation', *OMRO* 73, 29–41.
- Berlin, Königliche Museen (1901–11) *Hieratische Papyrus aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin*, I–V, Leipzig.
- (1913–24) *Ägyptische Inschriften aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin*, I–II, Leipzig.
- Bernabé, A. (2003) 'Las Ephesia Grammata: génesis de una fórmula mágica', *MHNH* 3, 5–28.
- (ed.) (2004–7) *Poetae epici Graeci: testimonia et fragmenta: Pars II, Orphicorum et Orphicis similium testimonia et fragmenta*, 1–3, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Munich and Leipzig.
- (2010) 'The gods in later Orphism', in Bremmer and Erskine (eds.) 2010, 422–41.
- (2013) 'The Ephesia Grammata: genesis of a magical formula', in Faraone and Obbink (eds.) 2013, 71–96.
- Bernand, A. and Bernand, É. (1969) *Les inscriptions grecques de Philae*, I–II, Paris.
- Bernand, É. (1969) *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine: recherches sur la poésie épigrammatique des grecs en Égypte*, Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 98, Paris.
- Betz, H. D. (1991) 'Magic and mystery in the Greek Magical Papyri', in Faraone and Obbink (eds.) 1991, 244–59.
- (1992) *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation – Including the Demotic Spells*, 2nd edn, Chicago and London.
- Bilde, P. et al. (eds.) (1992) *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*, Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 3, Aarhus.
- Blackman, A. M. (1925) 'Oracles in ancient Egypt I', *JEA* 11, 249–55.
- (1926) 'Oracles in ancient Egypt II', *JEA* 12, 176–85.
- Blázquez, J. M. (1967) 'El caballo en las creencias griegas y en las de otros pueblos circunmediterraneos', *RBPB* 45, 48–80.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bleeker, C. J. (1973) *Hathor and Thoth: Two Key Figures of the Ancient Egyptian Religion*, Leiden.
- Boedeker, D. (1983) 'Hecate: a transfunctional goddess in the theogony?', *TAPA* 113, 79–93.
- Bohak, G. (2003) 'Hebrew, Hebrew everywhere? Notes on the interpretation of voces magicæ', in Noegel, Walker and Wheeler (eds.) 2003, 69–82.
- (2008) *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History*, Cambridge.
- Bohak, G., Harari, Y. and Shaked, S. (eds.) (2011) *Continuity and Innovation in the Magical Tradition*, Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 15, Leiden and Boston.
- Bonner, C. (1930) 'Note on the Paris magical papyrus', *CPh* 25, 180–3.
- (1949) 'Note on an amulet in Vienna', *AJA* 53, 270–2.
- (1950) *Studies in Magical Amulets Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*, Ann Arbor.
- Bonnet, H. (ed.) (1971) *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte*, Berlin.
- Borgeaud, P. (1996) *La mère des dieux: de Cybèle à la Vierge Marie*, La librairie du XXe siècle, Paris.
- Borgeaud, P. and Volokhine, Y. (2000) 'La formation de la légende de Sarapis: une approche transculturelle', *ARG* 2, 37–76.
- Borghouts, J. F. (1978) *Ancient Egyptian Magical Texts*, Nisaba 9, Leiden.
- (1987) 'ꜥḥ.w (akhw) and ḥkꜣ.w (hekau) two basic notions of ancient Egyptian magic, and the concept of the divine creative word', in Roccati and Siliotti (eds.) 1987, 29–46.
- Bornmann, F. (1968) *Callimachi hymnus in Dianam*, Biblioteca di Studi Superiori 55, Florence.
- Bouche-Leclercq, A. (1979) *L'astrologie grecque*, 3rd edn, Paris.
- Bowman, A. K. (1986) *Egypt after the Pharaohs: 332 BC–AD 642: from Alexander to the Arab Conquest*, London.
- Bowman, A. K. and Woolf, G. (eds.) (1994) *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, Cambridge.
- Boyancé, P. (1966) 'L'Apollon solaire', in *Mélanges d'archéologie, d'épigraphie et d'histoire offerts à Jérôme Carcopino*, Paris, 149–70.
- Boylan, P. (1922) *Thoth, the Hermes of Egypt: A Study of Some Aspects of Theological Thought in Ancient Egypt*, London.
- Braarvig, J. (1999) 'Magic: reconsidering the grand dichotomy', in Jordan, Montgomery and Thomassen (eds.) 1999, 21–54.
- Brakke, D. (2010) *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*, Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- Brashear, W. M. (1979) 'Ein Berliner Zauberpapyrus', *ZPE* 33, 261–78.
- (1995) 'The Greek Magical Papyri: an introduction and survey', *ANRW II*, 18.5, 3380–684.
- Braswell, B. K. (1988) *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*, Texte und Kommentare 14, Berlin.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brelich, A. (1955–7) 'Les monosandales', *NouvClio* 7–9, 469–84.
- Bremer, J. M. (1981) 'Greek hymns', in H. S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, Leiden, 193–215.
- Bremmer, J. N. (1999) 'The birth of the term "magic"', *ZPE* 126, 1–12.
- Bremmer, J. N. and Erskine, A. (eds.) (2010) *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5, Edinburgh.
- Bresciani, E. (2005) *La porta dei sogni: interpreti e sognatori nell'Egitto antico*, Saggi 867, Turin.
- Bricault, L. (1996) *Myrionymy: les épicles grecques et latines d'Isis, de Sarapis et d'Anubis*, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 82, Stuttgart.
- (2005) *Recueil des inscriptions concernant les cultes isiaques*, MAI 31, Paris.
- Brisson, L. (1995) *Orphée et l'orphisme dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine*, Aldershot.
- Bruneau, P. (1961) 'Isis pélagia a Délos', *BCH* 85, 435–46.
- (1963) 'Isis pélagia a Délos (Compléments)', *BCH* 87, 301–8.
- Brunner-Traut, E. (1977) 'Der Sehgott und der Hörgott in Literatur und Theologie', in J. Assmann, E. Feucht and R. Grieshammer (eds.), *Fragen an die altägyptische Literatur: Studien zum Gedenken an Eberhard Otto*, Wiesbaden, 125–45.
- Buchholz, M. (2013) 'Questions to oracles in Graeco-Roman Egypt: a quantitative approach to the papyrological evidence', in Kajava (ed.) 2013, 89–109.
- Budde, D. (2003) 'Harpape-pa-chered: ein ägyptisches Götterkind im Theben der Spätzeit und griechisch-römischen Epoche', in D. Budde, S. Sandri and U. Verhoeven (eds.), *Kindgötter im Ägypten der griechisch-römischen Zeit: Zeugnisse aus Stadt und Tempel als Spiegel des interkulturellen Kontakts*, OLA 128, Leuven, 15–110.
- Budge, E. A. W. (1898) *The Book of the Dead: The Chapters of Coming Forth by Day: The Egyptian Text according to the Theban Recension in Hieroglyphic Edited from Numerous Papyri, with a Translation, Vocabulary, etc.*, I–III, London.
- (1904) *The Gods of the Egyptians or Studies in Egyptian Mythology*, London.
- Budin, S. L. (2003) *The Origin of Aphrodite*, Bethesda, Md.
- Bulloch, A. (1984) 'The future of a Hellenistic illusion: some observations on Callimachus and religion', *MH* 41, 209–30.
- Burkert, W. (1979) *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Berkeley.
- (1994) 'Griechische Hymnoi', in W. Burkert and F. Stolz (eds.), *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich*, OBO 131, Fribourg, 9–17.
- Busch, P. (2006) *Das Testament Salomos: die älteste christliche Dämonologie, kommentiert und in deutscher Erstübersetzung*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 153, Berlin and New York.
- Calvo Martínez, J. L. (2003) 'Dos himnos "mágicos" al Creador: edición crítica con introducción y comentario', *MHNH* 3, 231–50.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (2004) 'El himno χαῖρε δράκων del papiro parisino: edición crítica con introducción y comentario', *MHNH* 4, 265–78.
- (2006) 'El himno a Helios "Ἄεροφοιτήτων ἀνέμων"', *MHNH* 6, 157–76.
- Cancik, H. and Schneider, H. (eds.) (1996–2003) *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, I–XVI, Stuttgart.
- Caquot, A. (1971) 'Anges et démons en Israël', in *Génies, anges et démons. Égypte. Babylone. Israël. Islam. Peuples altaïques. Inde. Birmanie. Asie du Sud-Est. Tibet. Chine*, Sources Orientales 8, Paris, 113–51.
- Carrier, C. (2009) *Le Livre des morts de l'Égypte ancienne*, Paris.
- Cartledge, P. (2002) *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*, 2nd edn, Oxford.
- Cartron, G. (2012) *L'architecture et les pratiques funéraires dans l'Égypte romaine*, I–II, BAR International Series 2398 (1–2), Oxford.
- Cassin, E. (1987) *Le semblable et le différent: symbolismes du pouvoir dans le Proche-Orient ancien*, Paris.
- Cauville, S. (1998–2001) *Dendara: Traduction*, I–IV, OLA 81, 88, 95, 101, Leuven.
- Černý, J. (1962) 'Egyptian oracles', in R. A. Parker (ed.), *A Saite Oracle Papyrus from Thebes in the Brooklyn Museum: Papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.3*, Brown Egyptological Studies 4, Providence, R.I., 35–48.
- Chassinat, É. (1934–2000) *Le temple de Dendara*, I–V; É. Chassinat and F. Daumas, VI; F. Daumas, VII–IX; S. Cauville, X–XI; Cairo.
- Chatley, H. (1941) 'Egyptian astronomy', *JEA* 26, 120–6.
- Choat, M. (2006) *Belief and Cult in Fourth-Century Papyri*, Turnhout.
- Chosson, M. (2004) 'La consultation des oracles en Égypte du Nouvel Empire à l'époque chrétienne', online Master's thesis, Maîtrise d'Histoire, L'Université de Marne-la-Vallée.
- Ciraolo, L. and Seidel, J. (eds.) (2002) *Magic and Divination in the Ancient World*, Ancient Magic and Divination 2, Leiden.
- Clarysse, W. (1995) 'Greeks in Ptolemaic Thebes', in Vleeming (ed.) 1995, 1–19.
- (2009) 'Egyptian religion and magic in the papyri', in Bagnall (ed.) 2009, 561–89.
- Clarysse, W., Schoors, A. and Willems, H. (eds.) (1998) *Egyptian Religion: The Last Thousand Years: Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur*, I–II, OLA 84, Leuven.
- Colin, F. (2001) 'Onomastique et société: problèmes et méthodes à la lumière des documents de l'Égypte hellénistique et romaine', in M. Dondin-Payre and M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier (eds.), *Noms, identités culturelles et romanisation sous le Haut-Empire*, Séminaire d'histoire romaine et d'épigraphie latine, Brussels, 3–15.
- Collart, P. (1919) 'L'invocation d'Isis d'après un papyrus d'Oxyrhynchos', *Revue égyptologique*, NS 1, 93–100.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Collins, D. (2008a) *Magic in the Ancient Greek World*, Blackwell Ancient Religions, Oxford.
- (2008b) 'The magic of Homeric verses', *CPh* 103, 211–36.
- Conman, J. (2003) 'It's about time: ancient Egyptian cosmology', *SAK* 31, 33–71.
- Cosi, D. M. (2000) 'Orfeo e l'orfismo', in Tortorelli Ghidini, Storch Marino and Visconti (eds.) 2000, 139–59.
- Cox Miller, P. (1994) *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*, Princeton.
- Cribiore, R. (1996) *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, American Studies in Papyrology 36, Atlanta.
- (2001) *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton and Oxford.
- Crum, W. E. et al. (1939) *A Coptic Dictionary*, Oxford.
- (1941) 'An Egyptian text in Greek characters', *JEA* 28, 20–31.
- Czerny, E. (2008) 'Remarques sur un hymne à Min-Amon et sur un bloc méconnu de Coptos', in L. Gabolde (ed.), *Hommages à Jean-Claude Goyon*, BdÉ 143, Cairo, 99–105.
- Daniel, R. W. (1983) 'P. Mich. Inv. 6666: magic', *ŽPE* 50, 147–54.
- (1991) 'Two Greek Magical Papyri in the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden: A Photographic Edition of J 384 and J 395 (=PGM XII and XIII)', *Papyrologica Coloniensia* 19, Opladen.
- Daniel, R. W. and Maltomini, F. (1990, 1992) *Supplementum Magicum*, I–II, Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sonderreihe Papyrologica Coloniensia XVI.1, 2, Opladen.
- Darnell, J. C. (2004) *The Enigmatic Netherworld Books of the Solar-Osirian Unity: Cryptographic Compositions in the Tombs of Tutankhamun, Ramesses VI and Ramesses IX*, OBO 198, Fribourg.
- Dasen, V. (1993) *Dwarfs in Ancient Egypt and Greece*, Oxford.
- (2011) 'Magic and medicine: gems and the power of seals', in Entwistle and Adams (eds.) 2011, 69–74.
- Dasen, V. and Nagy, Á. M. (2012) 'Le serpent léontocéphale Chnoubis et la magie de l'époque romaine impériale', *Anthropozoologica* 47.1, 291–314.
- Daumas, F. (1959) *Les mammisis de Dendara*, PIFAO, Cairo.
- (1965) *Les dieux de l'Égypte*, Paris.
- Davies, N. de G. (1953) *The Temple of Hibis in El Khargeh Oasis. Part III: The Decoration*, New York.
- Dawson, W. R. (1928) 'The number "seven" in Egyptian texts', *Aegyptus* 8, 97–107.
- Degani, E. (1961) *Aión da Omero ad Aristotele*, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università di Padova 37, Padua.
- Delatte, A. (1914) 'Études sur la magie grecque V ΑΚΕΦΑΛΟC ΘΕΟC', *BCH* 38, 189–249.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Delatte, A. and Derchain, P. (1964) *Les intailles magiques Gréco-Égyptiennes*, Paris.
- Delia, D. (1998) 'Isis, or the Moon', in Clarysse, Schoors and Willemss (eds.) 1998, I, 539–50.
- De Martino, E. (ed.) (1984) *Magia e civiltà*, 3rd edn, Milan.
- Depauw, M. (1997) *A Companion to Demotic Studies*, Papyrologica Bruxellensia, Brussels.
- (2012) 'Language use, literacy, and bilingualism', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 493–506.
- Derchain, P. (1972) *Hathor quadrifrons: recherches sur la syntaxe d'un mythe égyptien*, UNHAI 28, Istanbul.
- Derchain-Urtel, M. T. (1981) *Thot à travers ses épithètes dans les scènes d'offrandes des temples d'époque gréco-romaine*, Brussels.
- De Rochemonteix, M. and Chassinat, É. (1897–1985) *Le temple d'Edfou*, I–II (2nd rev. edn. S. Cauville and D. Devauchelle, 1984–7) and III; É. Chassinat, IV–XIV; S. Cauville and D. Devauchelle, XV, MMAF 10–11, 20–32, Cairo.
- Detienne, M. (2001) 'Forgetting Delphi between Apollo and Dionysus', *CPh* 96.2, 147–58.
- Detienne, M. and Verth, A. B. (1971) 'Athena and the mastery of the horse', *HR* 11, 161–84.
- Deubner, L. (1982) *Kleine Schriften zur klassischen Altertumskunde*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 140, Königstein.
- Devauchelle, D. (2010) 'Osiris, Apis, Sarapis et les autres: remarques sur les Osiris Memphites au Ier millénaire av. J.-C.', in L. Coulon (ed.), *Les cultes d'Osiris au Ier millénaire av. J.-C.: découvertes et travaux récents: actes de la table ronde internationale tenue à Lyon, Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée (université Lumière-Lyon 2), les 8 et 9 juillet 2005*, BdÉ 153, Cairo, 49–62.
- (2012) 'Pas d'Apis pour Sarapis!', in A. Gasse, F. Servajean and C. Thiers (eds.), *Et in Ægypto et ad Ægyptum, Recueil d'études dédiées à Jean-Claude Grenier*, I–IV, CÉNiM 5.1–4, Montpellier, II, 213–26.
- De Wit, C. (1951) *Le rôle et le sens du lion dans l'Égypte ancienne*, Leiden.
- (1954) 'Les inscriptions des lions-gargouilles du temple d'Edfou', *CdÉ* 29, 29–45.
- (1957) 'Les génies des quatre vents au temple d'Opet', *CdÉ* 32, 25–39.
- Dickie, M. W. (2001) *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*, London.
- Diehl, C. and Cousin, G. (1887) 'Inscriptions de Lagina', *BCH* 11, 5–39.
- Dieleman, J. (2004) 'Ein spätägyptisches magisches Handbuch: eine neue PDM oder PGM?', in F. Hoffmann and H. J. Thissen (eds.), *Res severa verum gaudium: Festschrift für Karl-Theodor Zauzich zum 65. Geburtstag am 8. Juni 2004*, Studia Demotica 6, Leuven, 121–8.
- (2005) *Priests, Tongues, and Rites: The London-Leiden Magical Manuscripts and Translation in Egyptian Ritual (100–300 CE)*, RGRW 153, Leiden.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (2011) 'Scribal practices in the production of magic handbooks in Egypt', in Bohak, Harari and Shaked (eds.) 2011, 85–117.
- (2012) 'Coping with a difficult life: magic, healing, and sacred knowledge', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 337–61.
- Dieterich, A. (1891) *Abraxas: Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des späteren Altertums*, Leipzig.
- (1911) *Kleine Schriften: mit einem Bildnis und zwei Tafeln*, Leipzig.
- Dietrich, B. C. (1962) 'Demeter, Erinys, Artemis', *Hermes* 90, 129–48.
- (1967) 'Some light from the East on Cretan cult practice', *Historia* 16, 385–413.
- Diggle, J. (1970) *Euripides: Phaethon*, Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 12, Cambridge.
- Dillery, J. (1999) 'The first Egyptian narrative history: Manetho and Greek historiography', *ΣPE* 127, 93–116.
- Dilthey, K. (1872) 'Ueber die von E. Miller herausgegebenen griechischen Hymnen', *RhM* 27, 375–419.
- Dornseiff, F. (1988) *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie*, 2nd edn, ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ 7, Leipzig.
- Dousa, T. M. (2002) 'Imagining Isis: on some continuities and discontinuities in the image of Isis in Greek Isis hymns and Demotic texts', in K. Ryholt (ed.), *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies, Copenhagen, 23–27 August 1999*, Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications 27, Copenhagen, 149–84.
- Dowden, K. and Livingstone, N. (eds.) (2011) *A Companion to Greek Mythology*, Chichester and Malden, Mass.
- Drew Griffith, R. (1997) 'Homeric διυπετέος ποταμοῖο and the celestial Nile', *AJPh* 118, 353–62.
- (2005) 'Gods' blue hair in Homer and in eighteenth-Dynasty Egypt', *CQ* 55, 329–34.
- Drioton, É. (1926) *Rapport sur les fouilles de Médamoud*, FIFAO IV, part 2 'Les inscriptions', Cairo.
- Dunand, F. (1973a) 'Le syncrétisme isiaque à la fin de l'époque hellénistique', in *Les syncrétismes dans les religions grecque et romaine: Colloque de Strasbourg (9–11 juin 1971)*, Paris, 79–93.
- (1973b) *Le culte d'Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée*, I–II, ÉPRO 26, Leiden.
- (1979) *Religion populaire en Égypte romaine: les terres cuites isiaques du Musée du Caire*, ÉPRO 76, Leiden.
- (1997) 'La consultation oraculaire en Égypte tardive: l'oracle de Bès à Abydos', in Heintz (ed.) 1997, 65–84.
- (1999) 'Syncrétisme ou coexistence: images du religieux dans l'Égypte tardive', in C. Bonnet and A. Motte (eds.), *Les syncrétismes religieux dans*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- le monde méditerranéen antique: actes du colloque international en l'honneur de Franz Cumont à l'occasion du cinquantième anniversaire de sa mort, Rome, Academia Belgica, 25–27 septembre 1997*, Études de philologie, d'archéologie et d'histoire anciennes 36, Brussels, 97–116.
- (2002) 'De la cendre à la myrrhe: les usages du corps mort en Égypte tardive', in F. Labrique (ed.), *Religions méditerranéennes et orientales de l'antiquité: actes du colloque des 23–24 avril 1999*, Institut des sciences et techniques de l'Antiquité (UMR 6048), Université de Franche-Comté, à Besançon, BdÉ 135, Cairo, 101–19.
- Dunand, F. and Lichtenberg, R. (1995) 'Pratiques et croyances funéraires en Égypte romaine', *ANRW II*, 18.5, 3216–315.
- DuQuesne, T. (ed.) (1995) *Hermes Aegyptiacus: Egyptological Studies for B. H. Stricker on his 85th Birthday*, DE Special Number 2, Oxford.
- Eaton, K. (2013) *Ancient Egyptian Temple Ritual: Performance, Pattern, and Practice*, Routledge Studies in Egyptology 1, New York.
- Edwards, C. M. (1986) 'The running maiden from Eleusis and the early Classical image of Hekate', *AJA* 90, 307–18.
- Engelmann, H. (1975) *The Delian Aretalogy of Sarapis*, ÉPRO 44, Leiden.
- Entwistle, C. and Adams, N. (eds.) (2011) 'Gems of Heaven': *Recent Research on Engraved Gemstones in Late Antiquity, c. AD 200–600*, British Museum Research Publication 177, London.
- Erman, A. (1900) 'Gebete eines ungerecht Verfolgten und andere Ostraka aus den Königsgräbern', *ZÄS* 38, 19–41.
- Erman, A. and Grapow, H. (1926–63) *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, Leipzig and Berlin.
- Evans, T. V. (2012) 'Latin in Egypt', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 516–25.
- Faraone, C. A. (1993) 'The wheel, the whip and other implements of torture: erotic magic in Pindar *Pythian* 4.213–19', *CJ* 89, 1–19.
- (1996) 'Taking the "Nestor's cup inscription" seriously: erotic magic and conditional curses in the earliest inscribed hexameters', *ClAnt* 15, 77–112.
- (1999) *Ancient Greek Love Magic*, Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- (2000) 'Handbooks and anthologies: the collection of Greek and Egyptian incantations in late Hellenistic Egypt', *ARG* 2, 195–214.
- (2004) 'The collapse of celestial and chthonic realms in a late antique "Apollonian invocation" (PGM I 262–347)', in R. S. Boustán and A. Yoshiko Reed (eds.), *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*, Cambridge, 213–32.
- (2005) 'Necromancy goes underground: the disguise of skull- and corpse-divination in the Paris magical papyri (PGM IV 1928–2144)', in Johnston and Struck (eds.) 2005, 255–82.
- (2006) 'Gli incantesimi esametrici ed i poemi epici nella Grecia antica', *QUCC* NS 84.3, 11–24.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (2010) 'Kronos and the Titans as powerful ancestors: a case study of the Greek gods in later magical spells', in Bremmer and Erskine (eds.) 2010, 388–405.
- (2011a) 'Hexametrical incantations as oral and written phenomena', in Lardinois, Blok and Van der Poel (eds.) 2011, 191–203.
- (2011b) 'Text, image and medium: the evolution of Graeco-Roman magical gemstones', in Entwistle and Adams (eds.) 2011, 50–61.
- (2013) *Vanishing Acts: Deletio Morbi as Speech Act and Visual Design on Ancient Greek Amulets*, *BICS* Suppl. 115, London.
- Faraone, C. A. and Obbink, D. (eds.) (1991) *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, Oxford.
- (2013) *The Getty Hexameters: Poetry, Magic, and Mystery in Ancient Selinous*, Oxford.
- Farnell, L. R. (1896) *The Cults of the Greek States*, I–V, Oxford.
- Faulkner, R. O. (1933) *The Papyrus Bremner–Rhind (British Museum no. 10188)*, Brussels.
- (1937a) 'The Bremner-Rhind papyrus II', *JEA* 23, 10–16.
- (1937b) 'The Bremner-Rhind papyrus III', *JEA* 23, 166–85.
- (1969) *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*, Oxford.
- Fauth, W. (1983) 'Arbath Jao', *OC* 67, 65–103.
- (1985–6) 'Aphrodites Pantoffel und die Sandale der Hekate', *GB* 12–13, 193–211.
- (1993) 'Dardaniel (PGM LXII 12–16)', *ŽPE* 98, 57–75.
- (1995) *Helios megistos: zur synkretischen Theologie der Spätantike*, RGRW 125, Leiden.
- (2006) *Hekate Polymorphos, Wesensvarianten einer antiken Gottheit: zwischen früh-griechischer Theogonie und spätantikem Synkretismus*, Schriftenreihe altsprachliche Forschungsergebnisse 4, Hamburg.
- Fecht, G. (1964) 'Die Form der altägyptischen Literatur: Metrische und stilistische Analyse', *ŽÄS* 91, 11–63.
- (1965) 'Die Form der altägyptischen Literatur: Metrische und stilistische Analyse', *ŽÄS* 92, 10–32.
- (1993) 'The structural principle of ancient Egyptian elevated language', in J. C. de Moor and W. G. E. Watson (eds.), *Verses in Ancient Near Eastern Prose*, AOAT 42, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 69–94.
- Feder, F. (2001) "'Gruß Dir, Min-Amun, Herr der Sehnet-Kapelle!': Eine Hymne auf ihrem Weg durch die "Kultgeschichte"', in C.-B. Arnst, I. Hafemann and A. Lohwasser (eds.), *Begegnungen: Antike Kulturen im Niltal, Festgabe für Erika Endesfelder, Karl-Heinz Priesse, Walter Friedrich Reineke, Steffen Wenig*, Leipzig, 111–22.
- Federn, W. (1960) 'The "transformations" in the Coffin Texts: a new approach', *JNES* 19, 241–57.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Festugière, A. J. (1949) 'À propos des aréologies d'Isis', *HThR* 42, 209–34.
- Fewster, P. (2002) 'Bilingualism in Roman Egypt', in J. N. Adams, M. Janse and S. Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*, Oxford, 220–45.
- Finnestad, R. B. (1985) *Image of the World and Symbol of the Creator: On the Cosmological and Iconological Values of the Temple of Edfu*, Studies in Oriental Religions 10, Wiesbaden.
- Fischer, H. G. (1987) 'The ancient Egyptian attitude towards the monstrous', in A. E. Farkas, P. O. Harper and E. B. Harrison (eds.), *Monsters and Demons in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds: Papers Presented in Honour of Edith Porada*, Franklin Jasper Walls Lectures 10, Mainz, 13–26.
- Fontenrose, J. (1959) *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins*, Berkeley.
- (1978) *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses*, Berkeley and London.
- (1988) *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult and Companions*, Berkeley and London.
- Foraboschi, D. (1988) 'Movimenti e tensioni sociali nell'Egitto romano', *ANRW II*, 10.1, 806–40.
- Foster, J. L. (1975) 'Thought couplets in Khety's "Hymn to the inundation"', *JNES* 34, 1–29.
- (1994) 'Thought couplets and the standard theory: a brief overview', *LingAeg* 4, 139–63.
- François, G. (1957) *Le polythéisme et l'emploi au singulier des mots Θεός, δαίμων dans la littérature grecque d'Homère à Platon*, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fasc. 147, Paris.
- Frandsen, P. J. (1998) 'On the avoidance of certain forms of loud voices and access to the sacred', in Clarysse, Schoors and Willems (eds.) 1998, II, 975–1000.
- Frankfort, H. (1958) 'The archetype in analytical psychology and the history of religion', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 21, 166–78.
- Frankfurter, D. (1997) 'Ritual expertise in Roman Egypt and the problem of the category "magician"', in Schäfer and Kippenberg (eds.) 1997, 115–35.
- (1998) *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*, Princeton.
- (2000) 'The consequences of Hellenism in late antique Egypt: religious worlds and actors', *ARG* 2, 162–94.
- (2001) 'The perils of love: magic and counter magic in Coptic Egypt', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10.3/4, Special Issue: Sexuality in Late Antiquity, 480–500.
- (2002) 'Dynamics of ritual expertise in antiquity and beyond: towards a new taxonomy of "magicians"', in MiMe, 159–78.
- (2005) 'Voices, books, and dreams: the diversification of divination media in late antique Egypt', in Johnston and Struck (eds.) 2005, 238–43.
- (2012) 'Religious practice and piety', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 319–36.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Friedrich, P. (1978) *The Meaning of Aphrodite*, Chicago and London.
- Furley, W. D. (1995) 'Praise and persuasion in Greek hymns', *JHS* 115, 29–46.
- (2007) 'A lesson to all: Lykurgos' fate in the Tbilisi hymn (P.Ross.Georg. I.11)', *ŽPE* 162, 63–84.
- (2010) 'Hymns to Tyche and related abstract entities', *Paideia* 65, 161–79.
- (forthcoming) 'Magic and mysteries: on the "Getty Hexameters" in their cultural context', in *Cultural Plurality in Ancient Magical Texts and Practices: Proceedings of the IWH Symposium 12th–13th September 2014, Heidelberg, ORA, Tübingen*.
- Furley, W. D. and Bremer, J. M. (2001) *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*, I–II, Tübingen.
- Gager, J. G. (1992) *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, New York and Oxford.
- Gardiner, A. H. (1905) 'Hymns to Amon from a Leiden papyrus', *ŽÄS* 42, 12–42.
- (1917) 'Professional magicians in Ancient Egypt', *PSBA* 39, 31–43.
- (ed.) (1935) *Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum, Third Series: Chester Beatty Gift*, I–II, London.
- (1957) 'Hymns to Sobk in a Ramesseum papyrus', *RdÉ* 11, 43–56.
- Gasse, A. (2004) *Les stèles d'Horus sur les crocodiles*, Paris.
- Geraci, G. (1988) 'Ἐπαρχία δὲ νῦν ἐστὶ: la concezione augustea del governo d'Egitto', *ANRW II*, 10.1, 383–411.
- Gifford, E. H. (trans.) (2002) *Preparation of the Gospel*, Eugene, Or.
- Gigli Piccardi, D. (1990) *La "Cosmogonia di Strasburgo"*, Studi e testi 10, Florence.
- Ginzburg, C. (1995) *Storia Notturna: una decifrazione del sabba*, 2nd edn, Turin.
- Givon, R. (1982) 'A god who hears', in van Voss et al. (eds.) 1982, 38–42.
- Golénischeff, W. (1877) *Die Metternichstele in der Originalgrösse*, Leipzig.
- (1927) *Papyrus hiératiques*, CGMC 83, Cairo.
- Gordon, R. (2002) 'Another view of the Pergamon divination kit', *JRA* 15, 189–98.
- (2014) 'Review of C. A. Faraone and D. Obbink (eds.) *The Getty Hexameters: Poetry, Magic, and Mystery in Ancient Selinous*, Oxford, 2013', *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 12.10.
- (forthcoming) 'Cultural appropriations in P. Brit. Mus. CXXI = PGrMag VII', in *Cultural Plurality in Ancient Magical Texts and Practices: Proceedings of the IWH Symposium 12th–13th September 2014, Heidelberg, ORA, Tübingen*.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1934) 'ΙΥΓΕ, POMBOΣ, rhombus, turbo', *JHS* 54, 1–13.
- Goyon, J.-C. (1987) 'Nombre et univers: réflexions sur quelques données numériques de l'arsenal magique de l'Égypte pharaonique', in Roccati and Siliotti (eds.) 1987, 57–76.
- Graefe, E. (1991) 'Über die Verarbeitung von Pyramidentexten in den späten Tempeln (Nochmals zu Spruch 600 (§1652a–§1656d: Umhängen des Halskragens)', in Verhoeven and Graefe (eds.) 1991, 129–48.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Graf, F. (1974) *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit*, RVV 33, Berlin.
- (1991) 'Prayer in magic and religious ritual', in Faraone and Obbink (eds.) 1991, 188–213.
- (1995) 'Excluding the charming: the development of the Greek concept of magic', in McMi, 29–42.
- (1997a) *Magic in the Ancient World*, Revealing Antiquity 10, Cambridge.
- (1997b) 'How to cope with a difficult life: a view of ancient magic', in Schäfer and Kippenberg (eds.) 1997, 93–114.
- (2009) *Apollo, Gods and Heroes of the Ancient World*, London.
- (2011) 'Magic and divination: two Apolline oracles on magic', in Bohak, Harari and Shaked (eds.) 2011, 119–33.
- Grandjean, Y. (1975) *Une nouvelle arétalogie d'Isis à Maronée*, ÉPRO 49, Leiden.
- Greene, W. C. (1944) *Moirai: Fate, Good, and Evil in Greek Thought*, Cambridge.
- Griffith, F. L. and Thompson, H. (1904–9) *The Demotic Magical Papyrus of London and Leiden*, I–III, London.
- Griffiths, J. G. (1975) *The Isis-book: Metamorphoses, Book XI, Apuleius of Madauros*, ÉPRO 39, Leiden.
- (1982) 'Motivation in early Egyptian syncretism', in van Voss et al. (eds.) 1982, 43–55.
- (1985) 'An Egyptian antecedent of ΑΙΩΝΕΡΓΕΤΗΣ', *AJA* 89, 167–8.
- Grimm, A. (1994) *Die altägyptischen Festkalender in den Tempeln der griechisch-römischen Epoche*, ÄAT 15, Wiesbaden.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. (1930) 'Epithets in the Orphic hymns', *CR* 44, 216–21.
- (1952) *Orpheus and Greek Religion: A Study of the Orphic Movement*, 2nd edn, London.
- (1993) *Orpheus and Greek Religion: A Study of the Orphic Movement*, 3rd edn, Princeton.
- Hadzisteliou Price, T. (1978) *Kourotrophos: Cults and Representations of the Greek Nursing Deities*, Studies of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society 8, Leiden.
- Hagedorn, D. and Worp, K. A. (1980) 'Von ΚΥΡΙΟΣ zu ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ: eine Bemerkung zur Kaisertitulatur in 3./4. Jhdt.', *ΖPE* 39, 165–77.
- Haldane, J. A. (1966) 'Musical instruments in Greek worship', *G&R* 13, 98–107.
- Hall, E. (1989) *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*, Oxford.
- Hall, J. M. (1997) *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Hani, J. (1970) 'Sarapis dieu solaire', *REG* 83, 52–5.
- Hartog, F. (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, The New Historicism 5, Berkeley and London.
- Hastings, J. et al. (eds.) (1908–26) *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, I–XIII, Edinburgh.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hatzfeld, J. (1920) 'Inscriptions de Lagina en Carie', *BCH* 44, 70–100.
- Headlam, W. (1902) 'Ghost-raising, magic, and the Underworld', *CR* 16, 52–61.
- Hegenbarth-Reichardt, I. (2006) *Der Raum der Zeit: eine Untersuchung zu den altägyptischen Vorstellungen und Konzeptionen von Zeit und Raum anhand des Unterweltbuchs Amduat*, ÄAT 64, Wiesbaden.
- Heintz, J.-G. (ed.) (1997) *Oracles et prophéties dans l'antiquité: actes du colloque de Strasbourg 15–17 juin 1995*, Travaux du centre de recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antiques 15, Paris.
- Heitsch, E. (1959) 'Zu den griechischen Zauberhymnen', *Philologus* 103, 215–36.
- (1960) 'Drei Helioshymnen', *Hermes* 88, 139–58.
- Helck, W. (1972) *Der Text des 'Nilhymnus'*, Kleine ägyptische Texte, Wiesbaden.
- Helck, W. and Otto, E. (eds.) (1972–92) *Lexikon der Ägyptologie*, I–VII, Wiesbaden.
- Hermesen, E. (1995) 'Die Bedeutung des Flammensees im Zweizegebuch', in DuQuesne (ed.) 1995, 73–86.
- Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A. (1989) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, II, Oxford.
- Heubeck, A., West, S. and Hainsworth, J. B. (1988) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, I, Oxford.
- Hilton Price, F. G. (1901) 'Notes upon a rare figure of Amen-Rā', *PSBA* 23, 35–6.
- Hintze, F. (1950) *Untersuchungen zu Stil und Sprache neuägyptischer Erzählungen*, Berlin.
- Hoffman, C. A. (2002) 'Fiat Magia', in MiMe, 179–94.
- Hoffmann, F. (2012) 'Hieratic and Demotic literature', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 543–62.
- Hopfner, T. (1974–90) *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber*, I–II, 2nd edn, Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 21, 23, Amsterdam.
- Hornung, E. (1963) *Das Amduat: Die Schrift des verborgenen Raumes*, I–III, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 7, 13, Wiesbaden.
- (1991) *Die Nachtfahrt der Sonne: Eine altägyptische Beschreibung des Jenseits*, Zurich.
- (1996) *Conceptions of God in Ancient Egypt: The One and the Many*, 2nd edn, Ithaca, N.Y.
- Howe, T. P. (1954) 'The origin and function of the Gorgon-head', *AJA* 58, 209–21.
- Huzar, E. G. (1988) 'Augustus, heir of the Ptolemies', *ANRW II* 10.1, 343–82.
- Innes, D. C. (1995) 'Demetrius, On Style', in S. Halliwell, D. Russell and D. C. Innes, *Aristotle, Poetics, Longinus, On the Sublime, Demetrius, On Style*, Loeb Classical Library 199, Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- Jackson, H. M. (1985) 'The meaning and function of the leontocephaline in Roman Mithraism', *Numen* 32, 17–45.
- Jasnow, R. (2002) 'Recent trends and advances in the study of Late period Egyptian literature', *JARCE* 39, 207–16.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Jasnow, R. and Zauzich, K.-T. (2005) *The Ancient Egyptian Book of Thoth: A Demotic Discourse on Knowledge and Pendant to the Classical Hermetica*, I–II, Wiesbaden.
- Jeanmaire, H. (1951) *Dionysos: histoire du culte de Bacchus*, Paris.
- Johnson, J. H. (1975) 'The Demotic magical spells of Leiden I 384', *OMRO* 56.29–64, 8–13.
- (1977) 'Louvre E 3229: a Demotic magical text', *Enchoria* 7, 55–102.
- (1986) 'The role of the Egyptian priesthood in Ptolemaic Egypt', in Lesko (ed.) 1986, 70–84.
- (ed.) (1992) *Life in a Multicultural Society: Egypt from Cambyes to Constantine and Beyond*, SAOC 51, Chicago.
- Johnston, S. I. (1990) *Hekate Soteira: A Study of Hekate's Roles in the Chaldean Oracles and Related Literature*, ACS 21, Atlanta.
- (1991) 'Crossroads', *ΣPE* 88, 217–24.
- (1992) 'Xanthus, Hera and the Erinyes (Iliad 19.400–418)', *TAPA* 122, 85–98.
- (1995a) 'The song of the iynx: magic and rhetoric in Pythian 4', *TAPA* 125, 177–206.
- (1995b) 'Defining the dreadful: remarks on the Greek child-killing demon' in MeMi, 361–87.
- (1999) *Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*, Berkeley and London.
- (2002) 'Sacrifice in the Greek Magical Papyri', in MiMe, 344–58.
- (2004) 'Fiat lux, fiat ritus: divine light and the late antique defense of ritual', in M. T. Kapstein (ed.), *The Presence of Light: Divine Radiance and Religious Experience*, Chicago, 5–24.
- (2008) *Ancient Greek Divination*, Malden, Mass.
- (2010a) 'Homo factor deorum est: envisioning the divine in late antique divinatory spells', in Bremmer and Erskine (eds.) 2010, 406–21.
- (2010b) 'Sending dreams, receiving dreams: *oneiropompeia* in theory and in practice', in E. Scioli and C. Walde (eds.), *Sub Imagine Somni: Nighttime Phenomena in Greco-Roman Culture*, Testi e studi di cultura classica 46, Pisa, 63–80.
- (2011) 'Hecate, Leto's daughter, in Orphic fr. 317', in M. Herrero de Jáuregui et al. (eds.), *Tracing Orpheus: Studies of Orphic Fragments; in Honour of Alberto Bernabé*, Sozomena 10, Berlin, 123–6.
- (2014) 'Goddesses with torches in the Getty Hexameters and Alcman fr. 94', *ΣPE* 191, 32–5.
- (forthcoming) 'Greek gods in the Magical Papyri', in *Cultural Plurality in Ancient Magical Texts and Practices: Proceedings of the IWH Symposium 12th–13th September 2014, Heidelberg*, ORA, Tübingen.
- Johnston, S. I. and Struck, P. T. (eds.) (2005) *Mantikê: Studies in Ancient Divination*, RGRW 155, Leiden.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Jordan, D. R. (1985a) 'The inscribed gold tablet from the Vigna Codini', *AJA* 89, 162–7.
- (1985b) 'Defixiones from a well near the southwest corner of the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* 54, 205–55.
- (1988) 'A love charm with verses', *ŽPE* 72, 245–59.
- (2001) 'Notes on two Michigan magical papyri', *ŽPE* 136, 183–93.
- Jordan, D. R. and Kotansky, R. (2011) 'Ritual hexameters in the Getty Museum: preliminary edition', *ŽPE* 178, 54–62.
- Jordan, D. R., Montgomery, H. and Thomassen, E. (eds.) (1999) *The World of Ancient Magic: Papers from the First International Samson Eitrem Seminar at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 4–8 May 1997*, Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 4, Bergen.
- Jördens, A. (2012) 'Status and citizenship', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 247–59.
- (2013) 'Aretalogies', in E. Stavrianopoulou (ed.), *Shifting Social Imaginaries in the Hellenistic Period: Narrations, Practices, and Images*, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 363, Leiden, 143–76.
- Jourdan, F. (2010) *Poème judéo-hellénistique attribué à Orphée: production juive et réception chrétienne*, Fragments 7, Paris.
- Jung, F. (2002) *ΣΩΤΗΡ: Studien zur Rezeption eines hellenistischen Ehrentitels im Neuen Testament*, Münster.
- Junge, M. (1983) 'Untersuchungen zur Ikonographie der Erinys in der griechischen Kunst', doctoral thesis, Faculty of Philosophy, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel, Kiel.
- Junker, H. (1931) 'Ein Doppelhymnus aus Kom Ombo', *ŽÄS* 67, 51–5.
- Kajava, M. (ed.) (2013) *Studies in Ancient Oracles and Divination*, *Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae* 40, Rome.
- Kákosy, L. (1964) 'Osiris-Aion', *Oriens Antiquus* 3, 15–25.
- (1981) 'Prophecies of ram gods', in L. Kákosy, *Selected Papers (1956–73)*, *Studia Aegyptiaca* 7, Budapest, 139–54.
- (1986) 'Probleme der ägyptischen Kosmogonien der Ptolemäer- und Römerzeit', in *Hommages à François Daumas*, I–II, Montpellier, II, 429–34.
- (1987) 'Some problems of the magical healing statues', in Roccati and Siliotti (eds.) 1987, 171–86.
- (1989) 'Survivals of ancient Egypt: religion, other domains of culture, Egyptian influence on Gnosticism and Hermetism (a brief survey)', in F. Pölöskei (ed.), *Studia in honorem L. Fóti*, *Studia Aegyptiaca* 12, Budapest, 263–87.
- (1990) 'Probleme des Synkretismus im griechisch-römischen Ägypten: Hermanubis', in P. Nagel (ed.), *Carl-Schmidt-Kolloquium an der Martin-Luther-Universität 1988*, Martin-Luther-Universität (Halle-Wittenberg) Wissenschaftliche Beiträge 1990/23 (K 9), Halle, 143–5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1995a) 'Probleme der Religion im r  merzeitlichen   gypten', *ANRW II*, 18.5, 2894–3049.
- (1995b) 'Ouroboros on magical healing statues', in DuQuesne (ed.) 1995, 123–9.
- (ed.) (1999) *Egyptian Healing Statues in Three Museums in Italy (Turin, Florence, Naples)*, Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino, Serie 1: monumenti e testi 9, Turin.
- (2000) 'Bemerkungen zur Ikonographie der magischen Heilstatuen', in C. Uehlinger (ed.), *Images as Media: Sources for the Cultural History of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean, 1st Millennium BCE*, OBO 175, Fribourg, 45–9.
- (2001) 'A late Horus cippus', in H. Gy  ry (ed.), *M  langes offerts    Edith Varga: 'Le lotus qui sort de terre'*, *BMusHongr Suppl.* 2001, 217–20.
- (2002) '   propos des statues gu  rissseuses et d'une statue de B  s au Mus  e du Louvre', in Koenig (ed.) 2002, 273–84.
- Kaper, O. E. (2003) *The Egyptian God Tutu: A Study of the Sphinx-God and Master of Demons with a Corpus of Monuments*, OLA 119, Leuven.
- (2005) 'Synkretistische G  tterbilder in hellenistischer und r  mischer Zeit (Kat.188–199)', in Beck, Bol and B  ckling (eds.) 2005, 305–9, 611–19.
- Kaplan, I. (1999) *Grabmalerei und Grabreliefs der R  merzeit: Wechselwirkung zwischen der   gyptischen und griechisch-alexandrinischen Kunst*, Ver  ffentlichungen der Institute f  r Afrikanistik und   gyptologie der Universit  t Wien 86, Beitr  ge zur   gyptologie 16, Vienna.
- Karanika, A. (2011) 'Homer the prophet: Homeric verses and divination in the Homeromanteion', in Lardinois, Blok and Van der Poel (eds.) 2011, 255–77.
- Karouzou, S. (1972) 'An Underworld scene on a black-figured lekythos', *JHS* 92, 64–73.
- Kern, O. (1910) 'Die Herkunft des orphischen Hymnenbuchs', in *Carl Robert zum 8. M  rz 1910: Genethliakon*, Berlin, 87–102.
- (1911) 'Das Demeterheiligtum von Pergamon und die orphischen Hymnen', *Hermes* 46, 431–6.
- Kippenberg, H. G. (1997) 'Magic in Roman civil discourse: why rituals could be illegal', in Sch  fer and Kippenberg (eds.) 1997, 137–63.
- Kirk, G. S. et al. (1985–93) *The Iliad: A Commentary*, I–VI, Cambridge.
- Klauser, T. et al. (eds.) (1950–) *Reallexikon f  r Antike und Christentum: Sachw  rterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*, Stuttgart.
- Klinghardt, M. (1999) 'Prayer formularies for public recitation: their use and function in ancient religion', *Numen* 46, 1–52.
- Klotz, D. (2006) *Adoration of the Ram: Five Hymns to Amun-Re from Hibis Temple*, New Haven.
- (2012a) 'Egyptian hieroglyphs', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 563–80.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (2012b) *Caesar in the City of Amun: Egyptian Temple Construction and Theology in Roman Thebes*, Monographies Reine Élisabeth 15, Turnhout.
- Klotz, D. and LeBlanc, M. (2012), 'An Egyptian priest in the Ptolemaic court: Yale Peabody Museum 264191', in Zivie-Coche and Guermeur (eds.) 2012, II, 645–98.
- Klutz, T. (2005) *Rewriting the Testament of Solomon: Tradition, Conflict, and Identity in a Late Antique Pseudepigraphon*, Library of Second Temple Studies 53, London.
- Knigge-Salis, C. (2006) *Das Lob der Schöpfung: die Entwicklung ägyptischer Sonnen- und Schöpfungshymnen nach dem Neuen Reich*, OBO 219, Fribourg and Göttingen.
- (2007) 'Das Lob der Schöpfung in ägyptischen Hymnen des ersten vorchristlichen Jahrtausends: literar- und überlieferungsgeschichtliche Annäherungen', *ThZ* 63, 216–36.
- Kockelmann, H. (2008) *Praising the Goddess: A Comparative and Annotated Re-Edition of Six Demotic Hymns and Praises Addressed to Isis*, *APf Beiheft* 15, Berlin.
- Koefoed-Petersen, O. (1936) *Recueil des inscriptions hiéroglyphiques de la Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg*, BAe 6, Brussels.
- Koenig, Y. (1981) *Le papyrus Boulaq 6: transcription, traduction et commentaire*, BdÉ 87, Cairo.
- (1994) *Magie et magiciens dans l'Égypte ancienne*, Bibliothèque de l'Égypte ancienne, Paris.
- (ed.) (2002) *La magie en Égypte à la recherche d'une définition, actes du colloque organisé par le Musée du Louvre les 29 et 30 septembre 2000*, Paris.
- (2009) 'Des "trigrammes panthéistes" ramessides aux gemmes magiques de l'Antiquité tardive: le cas d'Abrasax, continuité et rupture', *BIFAO* 109, 311–25.
- (2013) 'La magie Égyptienne: de l'image à la ressemblance', in Tardieu, Van den Kerchove and Zago (eds.) 2013, 177–89.
- Koops, M. A. (1932) *Observationes in Hymnos Orphicos*, Leiden.
- Kotansky, R. (1991) 'Incantations and prayers for salvation on inscribed Greek amulets', in Faraone and Obbink (eds.) 1991, 107–37.
- Kousoulis, P. I. (2002) 'Spell III of the Metternich Stela: magic, religion and medicine as a unity', *GM* 190, 53–63.
- (ed.) (2011) *Ancient Egyptian Demonology: Studies on the Boundaries between the Demonic and the Divine in Egyptian Magic*, OLA 175, Leuven.
- Kramer, S. N. (1960) 'Death and Netherworld according to the Sumerian literary texts', *Iraq* 22, 59–68.
- Kraus, T. (1960) *Hekate: Studien zu Wesen und Bild der Göttin in Kleinasien und Griechenland*, Heidelberger kunstgeschichtliche Abhandlungen n.F. 5, Heidelberg.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Krauss, R. (1997) *Astronomische Konzepte und Jenseitsvorstellungen in den Pyramidentexten*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 59, Wiesbaden.
- Kruchten, J.-M. (1997) 'La terminologie de la consultation de l'oracle de l'Amon Thébain à la troisième période intermédiaire', in Heintz (ed.) 1997, 55–64.
- Kuhlmann, K. P. (1988) *Das Ammonion: Archäologie, Geschichte und Kulturpraxis des Orakels von Siwa*, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Kairo 75, Mainz.
- Kurth, D. (1994) *Treffpunkt der Götter: Inschriften aus dem Tempel des Horus von Edfu*, Zurich.
- Kurth, D. et al. (eds.) (1998) *Edfu VIII (Die Inschriften des Tempels von Edfu), Abteilung I, Übersetzungen 1*, Wiesbaden.
- Lajtar, A. (2012) 'The Theban region under the Roman empire', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 171–88.
- Lampinen, A. (2013) 'Θεῶν μεμελημένε Φοῖβω: oracular functionaries at Claros and Didyma in the imperial period', in Kajava (ed.) 2013, 49–88.
- Lange, H. O. (1927) *Der magische Papyrus Harris*, Copenhagen.
- Lardinois, A. P. M. H., Blok, J. H. and Van der Poel, M. G. M. (eds.) (2011) *Sacred Words: Orality, Literacy and Religion*, Orality and Literacy in the Ancient World 8, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 332, Leiden.
- Laumonier, A. (1958) *Les cultes indigènes en Carie*, BEFAR 188, Paris.
- Lawson, J. C. (1934) 'The evocation of Darius (Aesch. *Persae* 607–93)', *CQ* 28, 79–89.
- Leclant, J. (1984) 'Aegyptiaca et milieux isiaques: recherches sur la diffusion du matériel et des idées égyptiennes', *ANRW II*, 17.3, 1692–709.
- (1986) 'Isis, déesse universelle et divinité locale, dans le monde gréco-romain', in *Iconographie classique et identités régionales*, *BCH* Suppl. 14, 341–53.
- Legrain, G. (1906) *Statues et statuettes de rois et de particuliers*, I–III, CGMC, Cairo.
- Leitz, C. (1999) *Magical and Medical Papyri of the New Kingdom*, Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum 7, London.
- (2002–3) *Lexikon der ägyptischen Götter und Götterbezeichnungen*, I–VIII, *OLA* 110–16, 129, Leuven.
- Lesko, L. H. (ed.) (1986) *Egyptological Studies in Honor of Richard A. Parker: Presented on the Occasion of his 78th Birthday, December 10, 1983*, Hanover, N.H.
- (1991) 'Ancient Egyptian cosmogonies and cosmology', in Shafer (ed.) 1991, 88–122.
- Lesses, R. (1996) 'Speaking with angels: Jewish and Greco-Egyptian revelatory adjurations', *HThR* 89, 41–60.
- Lévêque, P. (1973) 'Essai de typologie des syncrétismes', in *Les Syncrétismes dans les religions grecque et romaine: Colloque de Strasbourg (9–11 juin 1971)*, Paris, 179–87.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Levi, D. (1944) 'Aion', *Hesperia* 13, 269–314.
- Lewis, N. (1970) "'Greco-Roman Egypt': fact or fiction?", in Samuel (ed.) 1970, 3–14.
- (1983) *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule*, Oxford.
- (1986) *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford.
- Lichtheim, M. (1983) *Late Egyptian Wisdom Literature in the International Context: A Study of Demotic Instructions*, OBO 52, Fribourg.
- Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S. and McKenzie, R. (1996) *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th edn, Oxford.
- LiDonnici, L. R. (2003) 'Compositional patterns in PGM IV (=P.Bibl.Nat. Suppl. gr. No. 574)', *BASP* 40, 141–78.
- Lilja, S. (1976) *Dogs in Ancient Greek Poetry*, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 56, Helsinki.
- Livrea, E. (1998) 'Sull'iscrizione teosofica di Enoanda', *ΣPE* 122, 90–6.
- Lloyd, A. B. (1982) 'Nationalist propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt', *Historia* 31, 33–55.
- (2011) 'Egyptian magic in Greek literature', in Kousoulis (ed.) 2011, 99–120.
- Loewe, M. and Blacker, C. (eds.) (1981) *Divination and Oracles*, London.
- London, British Museum (1911–) *Hieroglyphic Texts from Egyptian Stelae etc. in the British Museum*, I–, London.
- Long, A. A. (1996) *Stoic Studies*, Cambridge.
- (2006) *From Epicurus to Epictetus: Studies in Hellenistic and Roman Philosophy*, Oxford.
- López Ruiz, C. (2010) *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East*, Cambridge.
- Loprieno, A. (ed.) (1996) *Ancient Egyptian Literature: History and Forms*, Leiden.
- (2003) 'Drei Leben nach dem Tod: wieviele Seelen hatten die alten Ägypter?', in H. Guksch, E. Hofmann and M. Bommas (eds.), *Grab und Totenkult im Alten Ägypten*, Munich, 200–25.
- Loulloupis, M. (1979) 'The position of the bull in prehistoric religions in Crete and Cyprus', in *Acts of the International Archaeological Symposium 'The Relations between Cyprus and Crete, c. 2000–500 BC': Nicosia, 16th April–22nd April 1978*, Nicosia, 215–22.
- Luiselli, M. M. (2004) *Der Amun-Re Hymnus des P. Boulaq 17 (P. Kairo CG 58038)*, Kleine ägyptische Texte 14, Wiesbaden.
- (2011) *Die Suche nach Gottesnähe: Untersuchungen zur Persönlichen Frömmigkeit in Ägypten von der Ersten Zwischenzeit bis zum Ende des Neuen Reiches*, ÄAT 73, Wiesbaden.
- Mainoldi, C. (1981) 'Cani mitici e rituali tra il regno dei morti e il mondo dei viventi', *QUCC* NS 8, 7–41.
- (1984) *L'image du loup et du chien dans la Grèce ancienne: d'Homère à Platon*, Paris.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Malaise, M. (1990) 'Bès et les croyances solaires', in S. Israelit-Groll (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology: Presented to Miriam Lichtheim*, I–II, Jerusalem, II, 680–729.
- Malten, L. (1914) 'Das Pferd im Totenglauben', *J(K)DAI* 29, 179–255.
- Maltomini, F. (1995) 'P. Lond. 121 (= PGM VII), 1–221: Homeromanteion', *ŽPE* 106, 107–22.
- Manning, J. G. (2010) *The Last Pharaohs: Egypt under the Ptolemies, 305–30 BC*, Oxford.
- Marcovich, M. (1986) 'Demeter, Baubo, Iacchus, and a redactor', *VC* 40, 294–301.
- Marót, K. (1932) 'Kronos und die Titanen', *SMSR* 8, 189–214.
- Marquardt, P. (1961) 'A portrait of Hecate', *AJPh* 102, 243–60.
- Martin, M. (2005) *Magie et magiciens dans le monde gréco-romain*, Collection des Hespérides, Paris.
- Martinez, D. (1995) 'May she neither eat nor drink: love magic and vows of abstinence', in MeMi, 335–59.
- Masaracchia, A. (1993) 'Orfeo e gli "orfici" in Platone', in A. Masaracchia (ed.), *Orfeo e l'orfismo: Atti del Seminario Nazionale (Roma-Perugia 1985–1991)*, QUCC Atti di convegni 4, Rome, 173–97.
- Massimilla, G. (1996) *Aitia, libri primo e secondo*, Callimaco, Biblioteca di studi antichi 77, Pisa.
- Mastrocinque, A. (2002) 'The divinatory kit from Pergamon and Greek magic in late antiquity', *JRA* 15, 173–88.
- (2003) 'Le gemme gnostiche', in *Bollettino di numismatica / Monografia n. 8.2.I: Sylloge gemmarum gnosticarum I*, Rome, 49–112.
- Mathieu, B. (1994) 'Études de métrique égyptienne III: une innovation métrique dans une "litanie" thébaine du Nouvel Empire', *RdÉ* 45, 139–54.
- McCown, C. C. (ed.) (1922) *The Testament of Solomon*, Leipzig.
- (1923) 'The Ephesia Grammata in popular belief', *TAPA* 54, 128–40.
- Meijer, P. A. (2007) *Stoic Theology: Proofs for the Existence of the Cosmic God and of the Traditional Gods: Including a Commentary on Cleanthes' Hymn on Zeus*, Delft.
- Meeks, D. (1971) 'Génies, anges et démons en Égypte', in *Génies, anges et démons. Égypte. Babylone. Israël. Islam. Peuples altaïques. Inde. Birmanie. Asie du Sud-Est. Tibet. Chine*, Sources Orientales 8, Paris, 19–84.
- (1991) 'Dieu masqué, dieu sans tête', *Archéo-Nil: Bulletin de la Société pour l'étude des cultures prépharaoniques de la vallée du Nil* 1, 5–15.
- (2006) *Mythes et légendes du Delta d'après le papyrus Brooklyn 47.218.84*, MIFAO 125, Cairo.
- Mendel, D. (2003) *Die kosmogonischen Inschriften in der Barkenkapelle des Chonstem-pels von Karnak*, MRE 9, Turnhout.
- Merkelbach, R. (1968) 'Ein ägyptischer Priestereid', *ŽPE* 2, 7–30.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1995) *Isis regina, Zeus Sarapis: die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt*, Stuttgart.
- Merkelbach, R. and Stauber, J. (1996) 'Die Orakel des Apollon von Klaros', *EA* 27, 1–53.
- Merkelbach, R. and Totti, M. (1990, 1991) *Abrasax: ausgewählte Papyri religiösen und magischen Inhalts*, I: *Gebete*, II: *Gebete (Fortsetzung)*, Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sonderreihe Papyrologica Coloniensia XVII.1, 2, Opladen.
- Mertens, J. (1992) 'Bibliography and description of Demotic literary texts: a progress report', in Johnson (ed.) 1992, 233–5.
- Meyer, E. (1877) 'Die Stele des Horemheb', *ZÄS* 15, 148–57.
- Meyer, M. and Mirecki, P. (eds.) (1995) *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, RGRW 129, Leiden.
- Michel, S. (2001) *Bunte Steine – dunkle Bilder: 'Magische Gemmen'*, Schriften der Archäologischen Sammlung Freiburg 5, Munich.
- (2002) 'Seele der Finsternis, Schutzgottheit und Schicksalsmacht: der Pantheos auf magischen Gemmen', *Vorträge aus dem Warburg-Haus* 6, 1–40.
- (2004) *Die Magischen Gemmen: zu Bildern und Zaubersformeln auf geschnittenen Steinen der Antike und Neuzeit*, Studien aus dem Warburg-Haus 7, Berlin.
- Miguélez Caverro, L. (2008) *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200–600 AD*, Berlin.
- Milne, J. G. (1928) 'Egyptian nationalism under Greek and Roman rule', *JEA* 14, 226–34.
- Minas-Nerpel, M. (2006) *Der Gott Chepri: Untersuchungen zu Schriftzeugnissen und ikonographischen Quellen vom Alten Reich bis in griechisch-römische Zeit*, OLA 154, Leuven.
- (2012) 'Egyptian temples', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 362–82.
- Mineur, W. H. (1984) *Callimachus: Hymn to Delos: Introduction and Commentary*, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 83, Leiden.
- Mirecki, P. and Meyer, M. (eds.) (2002) *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, RGRW 141, Leiden.
- Montevecchi, O. (1957) 'Pantokrator', in *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*, I–III, Milan, 401–32.
- (1988) 'L'amministrazione dell'Egitto sotto i Giulio-Claudi', *ANRW II*, 10.1, 412–71.
- Morand, A.-F. (2001) *Études sur les hymnes orphiques*, RGRW 143, Leiden.
- Morenz, S. (1973) *Egyptian Religion*, London.
- (1975) 'Anubis mit dem Schlüssel', in E. Blumenthal and S. Herrmann (eds.), *Religion und Geschichte des alten Ägypten: gesammelte Aufsätze*, Cologne, 510–20.
- Morenz, S. and Schubert, J. (1954) *Der Gott auf der Blume: eine ägyptische Kosmogonie und ihre weltweite Bildwirkung*, Ascona.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Morgan, E. E. (2004) *Untersuchungen zu den Ohrenstelen aus Deir el Medine*, ÄAT 61, Wiesbaden.
- Morrison, J. S. (1981) 'The Classical world', in Loewe and Blacker (eds.) 1981, 87–114.
- Morschauser, S. (1991) *Threat-Formulae in Ancient Egypt: A Study of the History, Structure and Use of Threats and Curses in Ancient Egypt*, Baltimore.
- Moyer, I. (2003) 'Thessalos of Tralles and cultural exchange', in Noegel, Walker and Wheeler (eds.) 2003, 39–56.
- Müller, D. (1961) 'Ägypten und die griechischen Isis-Aretalogien', *ASAW* 53.1.
- Mundkur, B. (1983) *The Cult of the Serpent: An Interdisciplinary Survey of its Manifestations and Origins*, Albany.
- Naether, F. (2010) *Die Sortes Astrampsychi: Problemlösungsstrategien durch Orakel im römischen Ägypten*, Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 3, Tübingen.
- Nagel, G. (1929) 'Un papyrus funéraire de la fin du Nouvel Empire [Louvre 3292 (inv.)]', *BIFAO* 29, 1–127.
- Nagy, Á. (2002) 'Figuring out the Anguipede ("snake-legged god") and his relation to Judaism', *JRA* 15, 159–72.
- Naumann, F. (1983) *Die Ikonographie der Kybele in der phrygischen und der griechischen Kunst*, Istanbul Mitteilungen 28, Tübingen.
- Needham, R. (1980) 'Unilateral figures', in R. Needham, *Reconnaissances*, Canadian University Paperbooks 249, Toronto, 17–40.
- Nelson, G. W. (1940) 'A Greek votive iynx-wheel in Boston', *AJA* 44, 443–56.
- Niwinsky, A. (1987–8) 'The Solar-Osirian unity as principle of the theology of the "State of Amun" in Thebes in the 21st Dynasty', *JVEG* 30, 89–106.
- Nock, A. D. (1929) 'Greek Magical Papyri', *JEA* 15, 219–35.
 (1934) 'A vision of Mandulis Aion', *HTHR* 27, 53–104.
 (1972a) 'Paul and the magus', in Stewart (ed.) 1972, I, 308–30.
 (1972b) 'Oracles théologiques', in Stewart (ed.) 1972, I, 160–8.
 (1972c) 'Soter and Euergetes', in Stewart (ed.) 1972, II, 720–35.
- Nock, A. D. and Festugière, A. J. (1945–54) *Corpus Hermeticum*, I–IV, Paris.
- Noegel, S., Walker, J. and Wheeler, B. (eds.) (2003) *Prayer, Magic, and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World*, University Park, Pa.
- Norden, E. (1956) *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*, 4th edn, Stuttgart.
- Nordh, K. (1996) *Aspects of Ancient Egyptian Curses and Blessings: Conceptual Background and Transmission*, Uppsala.
- Nyord, R. (2009) *Breathing Flesh: Conceptions of the Body in the Ancient Egyptian Coffin Texts*, Copenhagen.
- Ogden, D. (2001) *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, Princeton and Oxford.
 (2002) *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A Sourcebook*, Oxford.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Oliver, J. H. (1936) 'The Sarapion monument and the paeon of Sophocles', *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 5 (The American Excavations in the Athenian Agora: Ninth Report), 91–122.
- O'Nolan, K. (1960) 'The Proteus legend', *Hermes* 88, 129–38.
- Osing, J. (1998) *Hieratische Papyri aus Tebtunis I: Text*, The Carlsberg Papyri 2, Carsten Niebuhr Institute of Ancient Eastern Studies Publications 17, Copenhagen.
- Paarmann, B. (2013) 'The Ptolemaic Sarapis-cult and its founding myths', in Zanzen, Hölscher and Trampedach (eds.) 2013, 255–78.
- Parke, H. W. (1967) *Greek Oracles*, Hutchinson University Library 89, London.
- (1985) *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*, London.
- Parke, H. W. and Wormell, D. E. W. (1956) *The Delphic Oracle*, I–II, Oxford.
- Parker, R. A. (1974) 'Ancient Egyptian astronomy', *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series A* 276.1257, 51–65.
- Parkinson, R. B. (1991) *The Tale of the Eloquent Peasant*, Oxford.
- (2002) *Poetry and Culture in Middle Kingdom Egypt: A Dark Side to Perfection*, London.
- Paschalis, M. (1994) 'The bull and the horse: animal theme and imagery in Seneca's Phaedra', *AJPh* 115, 105–28.
- Peek, W. (1930) *Der Isishymnus von Andros und verwandte Texte*, Berlin.
- Perdrizet, P. (1903) 'ΣΦΡΑΓΙΣ ΣΟΛΟΜΟΝΟΣ', *RÉG* 16, 42–61.
- (1928) 'Amulette grecque trouvée en Syrie', *RÉG* 41, 71–82.
- Perdrizet, P. and Lefebvre, G. (1978) *Inscriptiones Memnonii sive Besae oraculi ad Abydum Thebaidis: les graffites grecs du Memnonion d'Abydos: nos. 1–658*, *Inscriptiones Graecae Aegypti* III, 2nd edn, Chicago.
- Perea Yébenes, S. (2000) *El sello de Dios (σφραγίς θεοῦ): nueve estudios sobre magia y creencias populares Greco romanas*, Madrid.
- Peremans, W. (1981) 'Les mariages mixtes dans l'Égypte des Lagides', in E. Bresciani et al. (eds.), *Scritti in onore di Orsolina Montevicchi*, Bologna, 273–81.
- Pestman, P. W. (1995) 'Haronnophris and Chaonnophris: two indigenous pharaohs in Ptolemaic Egypt (205–186 BC)', in Vleeming (ed.) 1995, 101–37.
- Petropoulos, J. C. B. (1988) 'The erotic magical papyri', in B. G. Mandilaras et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25–31 May 1986*, I–II, Athens, 215–22.
- Pettazzoni, R. (1938) 'Le corps parsemé d'yeux', *Žalmoxis* 1, 3–12.
- (1955a) 'On the attributes of God', *Numen* 2, 1–27.
- (1955b) *L'onniscienza di dio*, Collezione di studi religiosi, etnologici e psicologici 24, Turin.
- Pettinato, G. (2003) *I miti degli inferi assiro-babilonesi*, Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 2, Letterature mesopotamiche 6, Brescia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Pfeiffer, S. (2005) 'Die Entsprechung ägyptischer Götter im griechischen Pantheon (Kat.171–181)', in Beck, Bol and Bückling (eds.) 2005, 285–90, 598–605.
- (2008) 'The god Serapis, his cult and the beginnings of the ruler cult in Ptolemaic Egypt', in P. McKechnie and P. Guillaume (eds.), *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 300, Leiden, 387–408.
- Phillips, C. R. III (1991) 'Nullum crimen sine lege: socioreligious sanctions on magic', in Faraone and Obbink (eds.) 1991, 260–76.
- Piankoff, A. (1930) *Le cœur dans les textes égyptiens depuis l'Ancien jusqu'à la fin du Nouvel Empire*, Paris.
- (1933) 'Le Naos D29 du Musée du Louvre', *RdÉ* 1, 161–79.
- (1964) *Litany of Re*, Bollingen Series 40/4, New York.
- Picard, C. (1964) 'Rhéa-Cybèle et le culte des portes sacrées', in L. Freeman Sandler (ed.), *Essays in Memory of Karl Lehmann*, Marsyas: Studies in the History of Art, Suppl. 1, New York, 259–66.
- Piehl, K. (1886) *Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques recueillies en Europe et en Égypte*, I–III, Stockholm.
- Pingiatoglou, S. (1981) *Eileithia*, Würzburg.
- Pirenne Delforge, V. (1994) *L'Aphrodite grecque: contribution à l'étude de ses cultes et de sa personnalité dans le panthéon archaïque et classique*, *Kernos* Suppl. 4, Athens and Liège.
- Podemann Sørensen, J. (1992) 'Native reactions to foreign rule and culture in religious literature', in Bilde et al. (eds.) 1992, 164–81.
- Porter, B. and Moss, R. L. B. (1960–) *Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs, and Paintings*, I–VII, 2nd edn, Oxford.
- Posener, G. (1986) 'La légende de la tresse d'Hathor', in Lesko (ed.) 1986, 111–17.
- Preisendanz, K. (1926) 'Akephalos, der kopflose Gott', *Beihefte zum Alten Orient* 8, 2–80.
- Preisendanz, K. and Henrichs, A. (eds.) (1973–4) [1941] *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, I–II [III], 2nd edn, Stuttgart.
- Preisigke, F. et al. (1915–) *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, I–, Strasbourg and elsewhere.
- Puech, H. C. (1930) 'Le dieu Bésa et la magie hellénistique', *DFIFAO* II 7, 415–25.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. (1993) *Le lamine d'oro 'orfiche': istruzioni per il viaggio oltremondano degli iniziati greci*, Biblioteca Adelphi 419, Milan.
- Pulley, S. (1994) 'The power of names in classical Greek religion', *CQ* 44, 17–25.
- Quack, J. F. (1995) 'Dekane und Gliedervergottung: Altägyptische Traditionen im Apokryphon Johannis', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 38, 97–122.
- (1996) 'Das Paviashaar und die Taten des Thot', *SAK* 23, 305–33.
- (1997) 'Ein ägyptisches Handbuch des Tempels und seine griechische Übersetzung', *ZPE* 119, 297–300.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1998) 'Kontinuität und Wandel in der spätägyptischen Magie', *SEL* 15, 77–94.
- (2002) 'La magie au temple', in Koenig (ed.) 2002, 41–68.
- (2003) "'Ich bin Isis, die Herrin der beiden Länder": Versuch zum demotischen Hintergrund der memphitischen Isisaretalogie', in S. Meyer (ed.), *Egypt, Temple of the Whole World/Ägypten, Tempel der gesamten Welt: Studies in Honour of Jan Assmann*, Studies in the History of Religions 97, Leiden, 319–65.
- (2004) 'Griechische und andere Dämonen in den spätdemotischen magischen Texten', in T. Schneider (ed.), *Das Ägyptische und die Sprachen Vorderasiens, Nordafrikas und der Ägäis: Akten des Basler Kolloquiums zum ägyptisch-nichtsemitischen Sprachkontakt Basel 9.–11. Juli 2003*, AOAT 310, Münster, 427–507.
- (2005a) *Einführung in die altägyptische Literaturgeschichte III: Die demotische und gräko-ägyptische Literatur*, Einführungen und Quellentexte zur Ägyptologie 3, Münster, Hamburg and London.
- (2005b) 'Ein Unterweltbuch der solar-osirianischen Einheit?', *WdO* 35, 22–47.
- (2006a) 'The so-called Pantheos: on polymorphic deities in Late Egyptian religion', in H. György (ed.), *Aegyptus et Pannonia III: Acta Symposii anno 2004*, Budapest, 175–90.
- (2006b) 'Ein neuer Zeuge für den Text zum neunköpfigen Bes (Papyrus Carlsberg 475)', in K. Ryholt (ed.), *The Carlsberg Papyri 7: Hieratic Texts from the Collection*, CNI Publications 30, Copenhagen, 53–64.
- (2007) 'Kritische Bemerkungen zur Bearbeitung von ägyptischen Hymnen nach dem Neuen Reich', *WdO* 37, 90–111.
- (2008) 'Demotische magische und divinatorische Texte', in B. Janowsky and G. Wilhelm (eds.), *Omina, Orakel, Rituale und Beschwörungen*, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments Neue Folge 4, Gütersloh, 331–85.
- (2009a) 'Menetekel an der Wand? Zur Deutung der demotischen Chronik', in Witte and Diehl (eds.) 2009, 23–51.
- (2009b) 'Review of V. H. Sederholm, *Papyrus British Museum 10808 and its Cultural and Religious Setting*, Leiden 2006', *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 104, 27–33.
- (2010a) 'Postulated and real efficacy in late antique divination rituals', *Journal of Ritual Studies* 24, 45–60.
- (2010b) 'Zwischen Landesverteidigung und Liebeswunsch', in T. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Zauber und Magie*, Studium Generale der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität, Sommersemester 2008, Heidelberg, 33–61.
- (2011a) 'Bedeutungen von Pyramiden', *Sokar* 12.23, 38–69.
- (2011b) 'Ist der Meder an allem schuld? Zur Frage des realhistorischen Hintergrundes der gräkoägyptischen prophetischen Literatur', in A.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Jördens and J. F. Quack (eds.), *Ägypten zwischen innerem Zwist und äußerem Druck: die Zeit Ptolemaios' VI. bis VIII.*, Philippika 45, Wiesbaden, 103–31.
- (2011c) 'Remarks on Egyptian rituals of dream-sending', in Kousoulis (ed.) 2011, 129–50.
- (2011d) 'From ritual to magic: ancient Egyptian forerunners of the chariteion and their social setting', in Bohak, Harari and Shaked (eds.) 2011, 43–84.
- (2012a) 'Anrufungen an Osiris als nächtlichen Sonnengott im Rahmen eines Königsrituals (Pap. Berlin P. 23026)', in V. M. Lepper (ed.), *Forschung in der Papyrussammlung: eine Festgabe für das Neue Museum*, Ägyptische und Orientalische Papyri und Handschriften des Ägyptischen Museums und Papyrussammlung Berlin 1, Berlin, 165–87.
- (2012b) 'Der Streit zwischen Horus und Seth in einer spätneuägyptischen Fassung', in Zivie-Coche and Guernier (eds.) 2012, II, 907–21.
- (2013) 'Sarapis: Ein Gott zwischen ägyptischer und griechischer Religion: Bemerkungen aus der Sicht eines Ägyptologen', in Zanzen, Hölscher and Trampedach (eds.) 2013, 229–55.
- (in press) 'From Egyptian traditions to magical gems. Possibilities and pitfalls in scholarly analysis', in A. Nagý et al. (eds.), *Acts of the International Workshop 'Magical Gems in their Contexts', Budapest 16–18 February 2012*.
- Quaegebeur, J. (1975) *Le dieu égyptien Shai dans la religion et l'onomastique*, OLA 2, Leuven.
- (1977) 'Tithoes, dieu oraculaire?', *Enchoria* 7, 103–8.
- (1983) 'Cultes égyptiens et grecs en Égypte hellénistique: l'exploitation des sources', in E. Van't Dack, P. van Dessel and W. van Hucht (eds.), *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven 24–26 May 1982*, Studia Hellenistica 27, Leuven, 303–24.
- (1984) 'Divinités égyptiennes sur des animaux dangereux', in P. Borgeaud, Y. Christe and I. Uriö (eds.), *L'animal, l'homme, le dieu dans le Proche-Orient ancien (Actes du Colloque de Cartigny 1981)*, Les Cahiers du Centre d'Étude du Proche-Orient Ancien 2, Leuven, 131–43.
- (1991) 'Les quatre dieux Min', in Verhoeven and Graefe (eds.) 1991, 253–68.
- (1995) 'Diodore I, 20 et les mystères d'Osiris', in DuQuesne (ed.) 1995, 157–81.
- Race, W. H. (1982) 'Aspects of rhetoric and form in Greek hymns', *GRBS* 23, 5–14.
- Radcliffe, G. Edmonds III (2011) 'Orphic mythology', in Dowden and Livingstone (eds.) 2011, 73–106.
- Rambova, N. (1957) 'The symbolism of the papyri', in A. Piankoff, *Mythological papyri*, I–II, Bollingen Series 40.3, Egyptian Religious Texts and Representations 3, New York, I, 29–65.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Raven, M. J. (2005) 'Egyptian concepts on the orientation of the human body', *JEA* 91, 37–53.
- Ray, J. D. (1981) 'Ancient Egypt', in Loewe and Blacker (eds.) 1981, 174–90.
- (1994) 'Literacy and language in Egypt in the Late and Persian periods', in Bowman and Woolf (eds.) 1994, 51–66.
- Redfield, J. M. (1975) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*, Chicago and London.
- Redford, D. B. (ed.) (2001) *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, I–III, New York.
- Rees, B. R. (1950) 'Popular religion in Graeco-Roman Egypt: II The transition to Christianity', *JEA* 36, 86–100.
- Remus, H. (1982) 'Magic or miracle? Some second century instances', *The Second Century: A Journal of Early Christian Studies* 2, 127–56.
- Rendall, G. H. (1921) 'Immanence, Stoic and Christian', *HThR* 14, 1–14.
- Reymond, E. A. E. (1977) *From the Contents of the Libraries of the Suchos Temples in the Fayyum. II. From Ancient Egyptian Hermetic Writings*, *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* NS 11, Vienna.
- Ricciardelli, G. (ed.) (2000) *Inni Orfici*, Milan.
- Richardson, N. J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford.
- (2010) *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite: Hymns 3, 4, and 5*, Cambridge.
- Riesenfeld, H. (1946) 'Remarques sur les hymnes magiques', *Eranos* 44, 153–60.
- Riess, E. (1935) 'Religious gleanings from the Magical Papyri', *CIW* 28, 105–11.
- Riggs, C. (2005) *The Beautiful Burial in Roman Egypt: Art, Identity, and Funerary Religion*, Oxford.
- (2010) 'Tradition and innovation in the burial practices of Roman Egypt', in K. Lembke, M. Minas-Nerpel and S. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Tradition and Transformation: Egypt under Roman Rule: Proceedings of the International Conference, Hildesheim, Roemer- and Pelizaeus-Museum, 3–6 July 2008*, Leiden and Boston, 343–56.
- (ed.) (2012) *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*, Oxford.
- Ritner, R. K. (1989) 'Horus on the crocodiles: a juncture of religion and magic in Late Dynastic Egypt', in J. P. Allen et al. (eds.), *Religion and Philosophy in Ancient Egypt*, *Yale Egyptological studies* 3, New Haven, 103–16.
- (1993) *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*, *SAOC* 54, Chicago.
- (1995a) 'Egyptian magical practice under the Roman Empire: the Demotic spells and their religious context', *ANRW II*, 18.5, 3333–79.
- (1995b) 'The religious, social, and legal parameters of traditional Egyptian magic', in MeMi, 43–60.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (2002) 'Necromancy in ancient Egypt', in Ciruolo and Seidel (eds.) 2002, 89–96.
- Ritoók, Z. (1978) 'Ein neuer griechischer Zauberpapyrus', *AAASH* 26, 433–56.
- Roccati, A. (1970) *Papiro ieratico n. 54003: Estratti magici e rituali del Primo Medio Regno*, Turin.
- Roccati, A. and Siliotti, A. (eds.) (1987) *La Magia in Egitto ai tempi dei Faraoni: Atti Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Milano 29–31 ottobre 1985*, Verona.
- Roeder, G. (1930) *Der Tempel von Dakke*, I–III, Cairo.
- Roller, L. E. (1999) *In Search of God the Mother: The Cult of Anatolian Cybele*, Berkeley and London.
- Romano, J. F. (1980) 'The origin of the Bes-image', *BES* 2, 39–56.
- (1998) 'Notes on the historiography and history of the Bes-image in Ancient Egypt', *BACE* 9, 89–120.
- Römer, M. (2003) 'Das "Gesicht" des Orakelgottes', *SAK* 31, 283–8.
- Ronzewalle, S. (1934) 'Sima-Athéna-Némesis', *Orientalia* 3, 121–46.
- Roscher, W. H. (ed.) (1884–1937) *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, I–VII, Leipzig.
- Roth, A. M. (2000) 'Father Earth, Mother Sky: ancient Egyptian beliefs about conception and fertility', in A. E. Rautman (ed.), *Reading the Body: Representations and Remains in the Archaeological Record*, Regendering the Past, Philadelphia, 187–201.
- Rudhardt, J. (1991) 'Quelques réflexions sur les hymnes orphiques', in P. Borgeaud (ed.), *Orphisme et Orphée: en l'honneur de Jean Rudhardt, Recherches et rencontres* 3, Geneva, 263–89.
- (2008) *Opera inedita: Essai sur la religion grecque. Recherches sur les Hymnes orphiques*, Kernos Suppl. 19, Liège.
- Rüter, S. (2009) *Habt Ehrfurcht vor der Gottheit NN: die šnd-n-Hymnen in den ägyptischen Tempeln der griechisch-römischen Zeit*, Die Inschriften des Tempels von Edfu: Begleithefte 2, Gladbeck.
- Rutherford, I. (1988) 'Pindar on the birth of Apollo', *CQ* 38.1, 65–75.
- (2000) 'The genealogy of the boukoloi: how Greek literature appropriated an Egyptian narrative-motif', *JHS* 120, 106–21.
- (2001a) *Pindar's Paean: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*, Oxford.
- (2001b) 'Paean at Ptolemais?', *ZPE* 135, 41–2.
- (2011) 'Mythology of the Black Land: Greek myths and Egyptian origins', in Dowden and Livingstone (eds.) 2011, 459–70.
- (2013) 'The immortal words of Paean', in Faraone and Obbink (eds.) 2013, 157–69.
- Ryhiner, M.-L. (1977) 'A propos de trigrammes panthéistes', *RdÉ* 29, 125–37.
- (1986) *L'offrande du Lotus dans les temples égyptiens de l'époque tardive*, Brussels.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ryholt, K. (1998) 'A Demotic version of Nectanebos' dream (P. Carlsberg 562)', *ZPE* 122, 197–200.
- (2005) 'On the contents and nature of the Tebtunis Temple Library: a status report', in S. Lippert and M. Schentuleit (eds.), *Tebtynis und Soknopaiu Nesos: Leben im römerzeitlichen Fajum. Akten des internationalen Symposiums vom 11. bis 13. Dezember 2003 in Sommerhausen bei Würzburg*, Wiesbaden, 141–70.
- Salles, R. (2009a) 'Chrysippus on conflagration and the indestructibility of the cosmos', in Salles (ed.) 2009b, 118–34.
- (ed.) (2009b) *God and Cosmos in Stoicism*, Oxford.
- Samuel, D. H. (ed.) (1970) *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology*, American Studies in Papyrology 7, Toronto.
- Sander-Hansen, C. E. (1956) *Die Texte der Metternichstele*, *Analecta Aegyptiaca* 7, Copenhagen.
- Sandman-Holmberg, M. (1946) *The God Ptah*, Lund.
- Saragoza, F. (2009) 'L'acéphale et le rituel osirien de Khoiak: à propos de quatre pièces découvertes au wadi Qubbanet el-Qirud', *Égypte: Afrique et Orient* 55, 51–66.
- Sarian, H. (1986) 'Réflexions sur l'iconographie des Érinyes dans le milieu grec, italote, et étrusque', in *Iconographie classique et identités régionales*, *BCH Suppl.* 14, 4–35.
- Satzinger, H. (1987) 'Acqua guaritrice: le statue e le stele magiche e il loro uso magico-medico nell'Egitto faraonico', in Roccati and Siliotti (eds.) 1987, 189–204.
- Sauneron, S. (1951) 'Aspects et sort d'un thème magique égyptien: les menaces incluant les dieux', *BSFÉ* 8, 11–21.
- (1953) 'L'hymne au soleil levant des papyrus de Berlin 3050, 3056 et 3048', *BIFAO* 53, 65–90.
- (1959) 'Les songes et leur interprétation dans l'Égypte ancienne', in S. Sauneron et al. (eds.), *Les songes et leur interprétation: Égypte ancienne, Babylone, Hittites, Canaan, Israël, Islam, Peuples Altaïques, Persans, Kurdes, Inde, Cambodge, Chine, Japon*, Sources Orientales 2, Paris, 16–61.
- (1960) 'Le nouveau sphinx composite du Brooklyn Museum et le rôle du dieu Toutou-Tithoès', *JNES* 19, 269–87.
- (1962a) 'Les conditions d'accès à la fonction sacerdotale à l'époque gréco-romaine', *BIFAO* 61, 55–7.
- (1962b) *Les fêtes religieuses d'Esna: aux derniers siècles du paganisme*, Esna V, PIFAO, Cairo.
- (1968) *Le temple d'Esna [Textes nos. 194–398]*, Esna III, PIFAO, Cairo.
- (1970) *Le papyrus magique illustré de Brooklyn*, Brooklyn.
- Sauneron, S. and Yoyotte, J. (1959) 'La naissance du monde selon l'Égypte ancienne', in *La naissance du monde: Égypte ancienne, Sumer, Akkad, Hourrites et*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hittites, Canaan, Israël, Islam, Turcs et Mongols, Iran préislamique, Inde, Siam, Laos, Tibet, Chine*, Sources Orientales 1, Paris, 17–91.
- Schäfer, P. (1990) 'Jewish magic literature in late antiquity and early Middle Ages', *JJS* 41.1, 75–91.
- Schäfer, P. and Kippenberg, H. G. (eds.) (1997) *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*, Studies in the History of Religions 75, Leiden.
- Schmidt, S. (2005) 'Serapis: ein neuer Gott für die Griechen in Ägypten (Kat. 182–187)', in Beck, Bol and Bückling (eds.) 2005, 291–304, 606–10.
- Schneider, T. (1991) 'Hiob 38 und die demotische Weisheit (Papyrus Insinger 24)', *ThZ* 47, 108–24.
- Schott, S. (1929) *Urkunden mythologischen Inhalts: Bücher und Sprüche gegen den Gott Seth*, Leipzig.
- (1945) *Mythe und Mythenbildung im alten Ägypten*, UGA Ae 15, Leipzig.
- Schultz, W. (1909) 'Ἐφέσια und Δελφικά γράμματα', *Philologus* 68, 210–28.
- Schwemer, D. (forthcoming) 'Beyond Ereškigal? Mesopotamian magic traditions in the Papyri Graecae Magicae', in *Cultural Plurality in Ancient Magical Texts and Practices: Proceedings of the IWH Symposium 12th–13th September 2014*, Heidelberg, ORA, Tübingen.
- Schwendner, G. (2002) 'Under Homer's spell: bilingualism, oracular magic, and the Michigan excavation at Dimê', in Ciraolo and Seidel (eds.) 2002, 107–18.
- Scott, N. E. (1951) 'The Metternich Stela', *BMM* ns 9.8, 201–17.
- Seaford, R. (1997) 'Thunder, lightning and earthquake in the *Bacchae* and the Acts of the Apostles', in A. B. Lloyd (ed.), *What is a God?: Studies in the Nature of Greek Divinity*, London, 139–51.
- Sederholm, V. H. (2006) *Papyrus British Museum 10808 and its Cultural and Religious Setting*, Probleme der Ägyptologie 24, Leiden.
- Seeber, C. (1976) *Untersuchungen zur Darstellung des Totengerichts im Alten Ägypten*, Münchner ägyptologische Studien 35, Munich and Berlin.
- Seele, K. C. (1947) 'Oriental Institute Museum notes: Horus on the crocodiles', *JNES* 6, 43–52.
- Segal, A. F. (1981) 'Hellenistic magic: some questions of definition', in R. van den Broek and M. J. Vermaseren (eds.), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions: Presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Leiden, 349–75.
- Segal, C. (1973) 'Simaetha and the Iynx (Theocritus, Idyll II)', *QUCC* 15, 32–43.
- Sethe, K. (1908–22) *Die altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte nach den Papierabdrücken und Photographien des Berliner Museums*, I–IV, Leipzig.
- (1916) *Von Zahlen und Zahlworten bei den alten Ägyptern und was für andere Völker und Sprachen daraus zu lernen ist: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte von Rechenkunst und Sprache*, SWGS 25, Strasbourg.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Sfameni Gasparro, G. (2002) *Oracoli profeti sibille: rivelazione e salvezza nel mondo antico*, Biblioteca di scienze religiose 171, Rome.
- Shafer, B. E. (ed.) (1991) *Religion in Ancient Egypt: Gods, Myths, and Personal Practice*, London.
- Smelik, K. A. D. and Hemelrijk, E. A. (1984) "Who knows not what monsters demented Egypt worships?" Opinions on Egyptian animal worship in antiquity as part of the ancient conception of Egypt', *ANRW II*, 17.4, 1853–2000, 2337–57.
- Smith, J. Z. (1995) 'Trading places', in MeMi, 13–27.
- (2003) 'Here, there, and anywhere', in Noegel, Walker and Wheeler (eds.) 2003, 21–36.
- Smith, Ma. (1977) 'A new version of a well-known Egyptian hymn', *Enchoria* 7, 115–49.
- (2009) *Traversing Eternity: Texts for the Afterlife from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*, Oxford.
- Smith, Mo. (1981) 'The hymn to the moon, PGM IV 2242–355', in R. S. Bagnall et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the XVI International Congress of Papyrology: New York, 24–31 July 1980*, ASP 23, Chico, Calif., 643–54.
- Smither, P. (1941) 'A Ramesside love charm', *JEA* 27, 131–2.
- Solmsen, F. (1957) 'The vital heat, the inborn pneuma and the aether', *JHS* 77, 119–23.
- Spalinger, A. (2008) 'The rise of the solar-Osirian theology in the Ramesside age: new points d'appui', in B. Rothöhler and A. Manisali (eds.), *Mythos & Ritual: Festschrift für Jan Assmann zum 70. Geburtstag*, Religionswissenschaft: Forschung und Wissenschaft 5, Berlin, 257–75.
- Stadler, M. A. (2009a) 'Spätägyptische Hymnen als Quellen für den interkulturellen Austausch und den Umgang mit dem eigenen Erbe: drei Fallstudien', in Witte and Diehl (eds.) 2009, 141–63.
- (2009b) *Weiser und Wesir: Studien zu Vorkommen, Rolle und Wesen des Gottes Thot im ägyptischen Totenbuch*, Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 1, Tübingen.
- Stambaugh, J. E. (1972) *Sarapis under the Early Ptolemies*, ÉPRO 25, Leiden.
- Steiner, G. (1971) 'Die Unterweltsbeschwörung des Odysseus im Lichte hethitischer Texte', *UF* 3, 265–83.
- Stephens, S. A. (2003) *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Berkeley.
- Sternberg-El Hotabi, H. (1999) *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Horusstelen: ein Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte Ägyptens im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, I–II, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 62, Wiesbaden.
- Stewart, Z. (ed.) (1972) *Arthur Darby Nock: Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, I–II, Oxford.
- Strauss Clay, J. (1984) 'The Hecate of the *Theogony*', *GRBS* 25, 27–38.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1993) 'The generation of monsters in Hesiod', *CPh* 88.2, 105–16.
- (2005) 'The beginning and end of the *Catalogue of Women* and its relation to Hesiod', in R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 25–34.
- Szepes, E. (1976) 'Magic elements in the prayers of the Hellenistic magic papyri', *AAASH* 24, 205–25.
- Szpakowska, K. M. (ed.) (2006) *Through a Glass Darkly: Magic, Dreams and Prophecy in Ancient Egypt*, Swansea.
- Tait, W. J. (1994) 'Some notes on Demotic scribal training in the Roman period', in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists, Copenhagen 23–29 August 1992*, Copenhagen, 188–92.
- (1995) 'Theban magic', in Vleeming (ed.) 1995, 169–82.
- Tambiah, S. J. (1990) *Magic, Science, Religion, and the Scope of Rationality*, Cambridge.
- Tardieu, M., Van den Kerchove, A. and Zago, M. (eds.) (2013) *Noms barbares 1: formes et contextes d'une pratique magique*, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études: Sciences religieuses 162, Turnhout.
- Tavener, E. (1933) 'Iynx and rhombus', *TAPA* 64, 109–27.
- Taylor, J. H. (2001) *Death and the Afterlife in Ancient Egypt*, London.
- Te Velde, H. (1967) *Seth, God of Confusion: A Study of his Role in Egyptian Mythology and Religion*, PÄe 6, Leiden.
- (1969–70) 'The god Heka in Egyptian theology', *JVEG* 21, 175–86.
- (1977) 'The theme of the separation of Heaven and Earth in Egyptian mythology', *Studia aegyptiaca* 3, 161–70.
- Thissen, H. J. (1991) 'Ägyptologische Beiträge zu den griechischen magischen Papyri', in Verhoeven and Graefe (eds.) 1991, 293–302.
- (1999) 'Homerischer Einfluss im Inaros-Petubasti Zsyklus?' *SAK* 27, 369–87.
- Thomassen, E. (1999) 'Is magic a subclass of ritual?', in Jordan, Montgomery and Thomassen (eds.) 1999, 55–66.
- Thompson, D. J. (1992) 'Language and literacy in early Hellenistic Egypt', in Bilde et al. (eds.) 1992, 39–52.
- (1994) 'Literacy and power in Ptolemaic Egypt', in Bowman and Woolf (eds.) 1994, 67–83.
- (2001) 'Hellenistic Hellenes: the case of Ptolemaic Egypt', in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 5, Cambridge, Mass. and London, 301–22.
- Tissi, L. M. (2013) 'Edizione critica, traduzione e commento dell'inno magico 5 Pr. (PGM III 198–228)', *Analecta Papyrologica* 25, 175–208.
- (2014) 'Edizione critica, traduzione e commento all'inno magico 11 Pr. (PGM II 81–101)', *APf* 60.1, 66–92.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Tortorelli Ghidini, M. (2000) 'Da Orfeo agli Orfici', in Tortorelli Ghidini, Storch Marino and Visconti (eds.) 2000, 11–41.
- Tortorelli Ghidini, M., Storch Marino, A. and Visconti, A. (eds.) (2000) *Tra Orfeo e Pitagora: origini e incontri di culture nell'antichità: atti dei seminari napoletani 1996–98*, Naples.
- Totti, M. (1988) 'Der griechisch-ägyptische Traumgott Apollon-Helios-Harpokrates-Tithoes in zwei Gebeten der griechischen magischen Papyri', *ŽPE* 73, 287–96.
- Tran Tam Tinh, V. (1984) 'État des études iconographiques relatives à Isis, Sérapis et Sunnaoi Theoi', *ANRW II*, 17.3, 1710–38.
- Traunecker, C. (1992) *Coptos: hommes et dieux sur le parvis de Geb*, OLA 43, Leuven.
- (1997) 'L'appel au divin: la crainte des dieux et les serments de temple', in Heintz (ed.) 1997, 35–54.
- Valbelle, D. and Husson, G. (1998) 'Les Questions Oraculaires d'Égypte: histoire de la recherche, nouveautés et perspectives', in Clarysse, Schoors and Willems (eds.) 1998, II, 1055–71.
- Van Baal, J. (1963) 'Magic as a religious phenomenon', *Higher Education and Research in the Netherlands* 7, 10–21.
- Van Beek, W. E. A. (1975) 'The religion of everyday life: an ethnosciencce investigation into the concepts of religion and magic', in W. E. A. van Beek and J. H. Scherer (eds.), *Explorations in the Anthropology of Religion: Essays in Honour of J. Van Baal*, Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 74, The Hague, 55–69.
- Van den Berg, R. M. (2001) *Proclus' Hymns: Essays, Translations, Commentary*, Leiden.
- Van den Broek, R. (1978) 'The Sarapis oracle in Macrobius, *Sat.*, I, 20, 16–17', in M. B. de Boer and T. A. Edridge (eds.), *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren: Recueil d'études offert par les auteurs de la Série Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain à Maarten J. Vermaseren à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire le 7 Avril 1978*, I–III, ÉPRO 68, Leiden, I, 123–41.
- (1996) *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*, Leiden.
- Vanderlip, F. V. (1972) *The Four Greek Hymns of Isidorus and the Cult of Isis*, American Studies in Papyrology 12, Toronto.
- Vandorpe, K. (2012) 'Identity', in Riggs (ed.) 2012, 260–76.
- Van Oppen de Ruiter, B. F. (2007) 'Religious Identifications of Ptolemaic Queens with Aphrodite, Demeter, Hathor and Isis', Ph.D. thesis, City University of New York, Ann Arbor.
- Van Voss, M. H. et al. (eds.) (1982) *Studies in Egyptian Religion: Dedicated to Professor Jan Zandee*, Studies in the History of Religions: *Numen* Suppl. 43, Leiden.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Varga, E. (1961) 'Les travaux préliminaires de la monographie sur les hypocéphales', *AOrientHung* 12, 235–47.
- Várhelyi, Z. (2001) 'Magic, religion, and syncretism at the oracle of Claros', in Asirvatham, Pache and Watrous (eds.) 2001, 13–31.
- Venit, M. S. (2002) *The Monumental Tombs of Ancient Alexandria: The Theater of the Dead*, Cambridge.
- Verdenius, W. J. (1987–8) *Commentaries on Pindar*, I–II, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 97, 101, Leiden.
- Vergados, A. (2013) *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text and Commentary*, Texte und Kommentare 41, Berlin.
- Verhoeven, U. (2005) 'Die interkulturelle Rolle von Priestern im ptolemäischen Ägypten (Kat. 166–170)', in Beck, Bol and Bückling (eds.) 2005, 279–84, 593–8.
- Verhoeven, U. and Graefe, E. (eds.) (1991) *Religion und Philosophie im alten Ägypten: Festgabe für Philippe Derchain zu seinem 65. Geburtstag am 24. Juli 1991*, OLA 39, Leuven.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1988) 'Le Tyran boiteux: d'Édipe à Périandre', in J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Édipe et ses mythes*, *Historiques* 43, Brussels, 54–86.
- Versnel, H. S. (1991) 'Some reflections on the relationship magic–religion', *Numen* 38, 177–97.
- (1998) 'An essay on anatomical curses', in F. Graf (ed.), *Ansichten griechischer Rituale: Geburtstags-Symposium für Walter Burkert, Castelen bei Basel, 15. bis 18. März 1996*, Stuttgart and Leipzig, 217–67.
- Vian, F. et al. (eds.) (1976–2006) *Les Dionysiaques, Nommos de Panopolis*, I–XIX, Collection des Universités de France, Paris.
- Villing, A. (2002) 'For whom did the bell toll in ancient Greece? Archaic and Classical Greek bells at Sparta and beyond', *ABSA* 97, 223–95.
- Vleeming, S. P. (1994) 'Some notes on Demotic scribal training in the Ptolemaic period', in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists, Copenhagen 23–29 August 1992*, Copenhagen, 185–7.
- (ed.) (1995) *Hundred-Gated Thebes: Acts of a Colloquium on Thebes and the Theban Area in the Graeco-Roman Period*, PLB 27, Leiden.
- Volokhine, Y. (2001) 'Une désignation de la "face divine" *ḥ3wt, ḥ3wḥy*', *BIFAO* 101, 369–91.
- Von Dassow, E., Wasserman, J., Faulkner, R. O. and Goelet, O. (eds.) (1994) *The Egyptian Book of the Dead: The Book of Going Forth by Day: Being the Papyrus of Ani (Royal Scribe of the Divine Offerings)*, San Francisco.
- Von Lieven, A. (1999) 'Divination in Ägypten', *AoF* 26.1, 77–126.
- (2007) *Grundriss des Laufes der Sterne: das sogenannte Nutbuch*, Carlsberg Papyri 8, CNI publication 31, Copenhagen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Wainwright, G. A. (1953) 'Herodotus II, 28 on the sources of the Nile', *JHS* 73, 104–7.
- Walcot, P. (1958) 'Hesiod's hymns to the Muses, Aphrodite, Styx and Hecate', *SO* 34, 5–14.
- Waldstein, M. and Wisse, F. (eds.) (1995) *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1, III,1 and IV,1 with BG 8502,2*, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 33, Leiden.
- Ward, W. A. (1972) 'A unique Beset figurine', *Orientalia* 41, 149–59.
- Watson, L. (1991) *Arae: The Curse Poetry of Antiquity*, Arca 26, Leeds.
- Wax, M. and Wax, R. (1963) 'The notion of magic', *Current Anthropology* 4, 495–518.
- Weidner, S. (1985) *Lotos im alten Ägypten: Vorarbeiten zu einer Kulturgeschichte von Nymphaea lotus, Nymphaea coerulea und Nelumbo nucifera in der dynastischen Zeit*, Pfaffenweiler.
- Weinreich, O. (1928) 'Trigeneration als sakrale Stilform', *SMSR* 4, 198–206.
- Welles, C. B. (1962) 'The discovery of Sarapis and the foundation of Alexandria', *Historia* 11, 271–98.
- (1970) 'The role of the Egyptians under the first Ptolemies', in Samuel (ed.) 1970, 505–10.
- Wells, R. A. (1992) 'The mythology of Nut and the birth of Ra', *SAK* 19, 305–21.
- Wente, E. F. (1995) 'The scribes of ancient Egypt', in J. M. Sasson et al. (eds.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, I–IV, New York, 2211–21.
- Werth, N. (2006) *Hekate: Untersuchungen zur dreigestaltigen Göttin*, Schriftenreihe Antiquitates 37, Hamburg.
- Wessely, K. (1886) *Bericht über griechische Papyri in Paris und London*, WS 8, Vienna, 175–230.
- West, M. L. (1966) *Hesiod Theogony*, Oxford.
- (1978) *Hesiod Works & Days*, Oxford.
- (1983) *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford.
- West, S. (1969) 'The Greek version of the legend of Tefnut', *JEA* 55, 161–83.
- Whitehorne, J. (1995) 'The pagan cults of Roman Oxyrhynchus', *ANRW II*, 18.5, 3050–91.
- Wiebach-Koepke, S. (2003) 'Sehen und hören in den Schilderungen der ägyptischen Unterwelt des Neuen Reiches', in N. Kloth, K. Martin and E. Pardey (eds.), *Es werde niedergelegt als Schriftstück: Festschrift für Hartwig Altenmüller zum 65. Geburtstag*, SAK Beihefte 9, Hamburg, 477–89.
- (2007) *Sonnenlauf und kosmische Regeneration: zur Systematik der Lebensprozesse in den Unterweltsbüchern*, ÄAT 71, Wiesbaden.
- Williams, F. (1978) *Callimachus, Hymn to Apollo: A Commentary*, Oxford.
- Williams, R. J. (1972) 'Scribal training in ancient Egypt', *JAOs* 92, 214–21.
- Witt, R. E. (1971) *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World*, London.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Witte, M. and Diehl, J. F. (eds.) (2009) *Orakel und Gebete: Interdisziplinäre Studien zur Sprache der Religion in Ägypten, Vorderasien und Griechenland in hellenistischer Zeit*, Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2.38, Tübingen.
- Wolf, W. (1929) 'Der Berliner Ptah-Hymnus', *ZÄS* 64, 17–44.
- Wolkstein, D. and Kramer S. N. (1983) *Inanna, Queen of Heaven and Earth: Her Stories and Hymns from Sumer*, New York.
- Wortmann, D. (1967) 'Die Sandale der Hekate-Persephone-Selene', *ZPE* 2, 155–60.
- Yiftach-Firanko, U. (2009) 'Law in Graeco-Roman Egypt: Hellenization, fusion, Romanization', in Bagnall (ed.) 2009, 541–60.
- Žabkar, L. V. (1968) *A Study of the Ba Concept in Ancient Egyptian Texts*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 34, Chicago.
- (1980) 'Adaptation of ancient Egyptian texts to the temple ritual at Philae', *JEA* 66, 127–36.
- (1988) *Hymns to Isis in her Temple at Philae*, Hanover and London.
- Zaganiaris, M. J. (1975) 'Sacrifices de chiens dans l'Antiquité classique', *Platon* 27, 322–9.
- Zago, M. (2010) *Tebe magica e alchemica: l'idea di biblioteca nell'Egitto romano; la Collezione Anastasi*, Padua.
- Zandee, J. (1963) 'Seth als Sturmgott', *ZÄS* 90, 144–56.
- (1992) 'The birth-giving creator god in ancient Egypt', in A. B. Lloyd (ed.), *Studies in Pharaonic Religion and Society in Honour of J. Gwyn Griffiths*, Occasional Publications of the Egypt Exploration Society 8, London, 169–85.
- Zanzen, N., Hölscher, T. and Trampedach, K. (eds.) (2013) *Aneignung und Abgrenzung: wechselnde Perspektiven auf die Antithese von 'Ost' und 'West' in der griechischen Antike*, *Oikumene* 10, Heidelberg.
- Zauzich, K.-T. (2000) 'Die demotischen Orakelfragen: eine Zwischenbilanz', in P. J. Frandsen and K. Ryholt (eds.), *A Miscellany of Demotic Studies*, Carlsberg Papyri 3, CNI Publications 22, Copenhagen, 1–25.
- Zeidler, J. (1999) *Pfortenbuchstudien*, I–II, Göttinger Orientforschungen Reihe 4, Ägypten 36, Wiesbaden.
- Zivie-Coche, C. (2009) 'L'Ogdoade à Thèbes à l'époque ptolémaïque et ses antécédents', in C. Thiers (ed.), *Documents de théologies thébaines tardives (D3T 1)*, CENiM 3, Montpellier, 167–225.
- Zivie-Coche, C. and Guermeur, I. (eds.) (2012) *Parcourir l'éternité: hommages à Jean Yoyotte*, I–II, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses 156: Histoire et prosopographie 8, Turnhout.
- Zografou, A. (2010) *Chemins d'Hécate: portes, routes, carrefours et autres figures de l'entre-deux*, *Kernos Suppl.* 24, Liège.
- Zuntz, G. (1988) 'Aion Plutonios', *Hermes* 113, 291–303.
- Zwierlein-Diehl, E. (2007) *Antike Gemmen und ihr Nachleben*, Berlin.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Abrasax, 69–70, 233
 anguiped, 124
- Achilles, 239
 epithets, 256
- Adonai, 70, 82, 363, 380, 382
- Agathos Daimon, 81, 137
 epithets, 133
- Aion, 34, 74, 80–1, 145, 153, 212
 epithets, 65
 eternity, 81, 208
 Plutonium, 104
- Alcyone, 261, 377
- Amun(-Re), 36, 77, 123, 168, 215, 389
 epithets, 73, 82, 92, 109, 112, 143,
 145, 148, 156, 187, 205,
 207, 319
 four-ram-headed, 47
 god of the winds, 102, 127, 143, 208
 hymns, 36, 77, 104, 107, 113, 122,
 125, 136, 143, 148, 162,
 206, 208, 211, 368
 from the temple at Hibis, 36, 47,
 146, 156, 160, 367, *see also*
 Index locorum, Hymns
 from the temple at Hibis
 in curses, 340
 of the ‘hearing ear’, 185
 oracles of, 76, 104, 338
 the hidden one, 45, 209
 theology, 45–50, 77, 95, 128, 139,
 145, 215, 387, 390, *see also*
 solar-creator god
 (Egyptian)
- Ananke, 222, 235, 242, 315, 327, 332,
 334, 353, 369
- Anubis, 241, 254, 341, 377
 epithets, 230
 Hermanubis, *see under* Hermes
- Aphrodite, 236, 288, 294, 297, 312,
 331, 364, 369, 372–3
 Aphrodite-Gaea-Nature, 291–2,
 296–7, 329–31, 336, 371
 Aphrodite-Hathor, 10, 289, 371, 382
 epithets, 179, 255, 261, 295, 314,
 316
HH to, *see under* Homeric Hymns (*HH*)
 in erotic magic, 239, 341
 magical hymns to, 51, 292, 331
 myth, 163, 238, 332
OH to, *see under* Orphic Hymns (*OH*)
 Persian, 256
- Apollo, 106, 115, 150, 345, 358, 363,
 367, 379–80, 382, 389,
 392, hymns **1**, **6**, **7** and **8**
passim
 Apollo-Helios, 69, 103, 339, 345,
 363, 365, 367, 382, hymn **7**
passim
 Clarius, 34, 180
 epithets, 103, 112, 351, hymns **1**, **6**,
7 and **8** *passim*
 god of music, 138, 180, 186
 god of the winds, 102
HH to, *see under* Homeric Hymns (*HH*)
 hymns, 33–4, 120, 179, 368
 magical hymns to, 51, 117, hymn **1**,
6, **7** and **8**
 myth, 65, 173, 196, 355, 368
 oracles, 34, 63, 171, 180, 189, 200,
 338–9, 361–2, 368, *see also*
 laurel, in Apollonian
 divination
 use of the name, 137, 343–4, 385
- Apophis, 96, 154, 340
 archangels, 67, 70, 78, 114, 126, 132,
 350, 380

INDEXES

- Ares
 epithets, 184, 197
 myth, 332
- Ariadne, 257
- Artemis, 10, 72, 235, 240, 256, 364,
 hymns **12**, **14** and **15** *passim*
 Artemis-Hecate, 227–9, 241, 262,
 306, 353, 384, hymns **12**,
14 and **15** *passim*
 epithets, 112, 171, 184, 194, 197,
 230, 256, 259, hymns **12**,
14 and **15** *passim*
 magical hymns to, 52, hymns **12**,
14 and **15**
 myth, 257, 261
OH to, *see under Orphic Hymns (HH)*
Potnia Theron, 269, 328
 Tauropolos, 289
- Asclepius, 33
 epithets, 63
- Athena, 72, 259
 epithets, 171, 230, 232, 256, 267,
 315
- Atum, 52, 79, 105, 155, 167, 377
 epithets, 156
- Baubo, 313, 377
- Bes, 8, 38, 48, 85, 98–9, 156, 188
 Bes-Pantheos, *see* polymorphic
 deities
 oracular, 338
- Brooklyn magical papyrus, 36, 49,
 77, 94, 148, 155, 168, 368
- bull/cow, 267, 270, 327, 357, 369, 376
 Apis bull, 8
 in connection with generative
 aspect, 296–7, 372–3
 in connection with Hathor, 10,
 288–9
 in connection with lunar deities,
 288–9
 in iconography, 153, 229
- Cerberus, 240, 254, 278, 377
- chaos, 84, 286
 Chaos, 85, 286, 333–4
- Charites, 263, 327, 370, 377
- Chimera, 153, 293
- Chnoubis, 166
- Chronus/Time, 272, 332, 378
 Orphic, 81
- Circe, 257, 259
 creator god, hymn **9** *passim*
 epithets, hymn **9** *passim*
 magical hymns to, hymn **9** *passim*
- Cronus, 76, 375
 Cronus' chains, 273, 332
 epithets, 65
 myth, 272, 377
- Cybele, 9, 262, 269
- Daphne/laurel, 179, 189–91, 194,
 199–201, 383
 myth, 173, 355, 368
- dead
 restless, 87, 97, 113, 219, 223–4,
 228, 233–4, 240, 287, 335
 transfigured, 88–9, 162, 224, 234,
 340
defixiones, 339
- Demeter, 9, 206, 270, 275, 292, 296,
 312, 332, 389
 epithets, 112, 257, 316, 319, 329, 331
HH to, *see under Homeric Hymns*
(HH)
 in curses, 339
- Melaina, 267, 290
- mysteries, 35, 257, 262, 274, 313,
 378
 myth, 267, 317
- Demotic
 magical papyri, 2, 19–25, 32
 parallels, 103, 113, 125, 160
 script, 1, 5–6, 11, 21, 25, 28, 37, 151,
 202

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Dike, 327, 375
Dione, 257, 312–13, 359
Dionysus, 184, 187
 epithets, 64, 179, 184, 199, 295, 317
 Orphic, 153
divine
 awe, 71–3, 120–3, 136–7, 211–12, 286
 omniscience, 70–1
dog/bitch, 230, 256, 258, 267, 275, 284, 292, 313
 Cerberus, *see* Cerberus
 in iconography, 229
 symbolism, 240–1
Egyptian
 magic, *see* *hkg*/Heka
 priestly milieu, 7, 12, 18, 23–4, 253, 270, 379, 382–5, 391
 temples, 5–8, 10–11, 19
Eileithyia, 257
elements of nature, 47, 72, 77, 107, 123, 146–8, 207, 215, 293, 330
Empousa, 305, 335
epiphany, 71–3, 120
Erebus, 85, 333–4, 378
Ereškigal, 236–7, 364
Erinyes, 232, 235, 240, 263, 267, 276, 290, 328–9, 333–4, 369, 373, 377
 Alecto, 328
 epithets, 230, 316, 352
 in curses, 339
 Magaira, 328
 Tisiphone, 328
Eros, 334
 epithets, 144, 197
ethnicity/cultural background, 3–5, 11, 26, 348
Eumenides, 329
 epithets, 352
 fire, 103, 105, 112, 157, 166, 182, 270, 320, *see also* uraeus
 element of nature, 94, 105, 157, 330, *see also* elements of nature
 means of destruction, 95, 104, 237, 293
Gaea, 225, 334, *see also* Aphrodite-Gaea-Nature
 epithets, 186, 257, 329
 HH to, *see under* *Homeric Hymns (HH)*
 in curses, 339
 myth, 317
 OH to, *see under* *Orphic Hymns (HH)*
Geb, 124, 375, 377
Getty hexameters, 34–5, 274
Gnostic conceptions, 68, 71, 81, 142, 144, 149, 210–11, 380
Gorgons, 232, 237, 268
 Medusa, 267, 313
Greek
 hymns, *see* hymns, Greek
 language, 5, 21, 24, 31, 359, 380
Hades, 80, 84, 314, 319
 Aidoneus, 313, 318
 epithets, 182
 place, 85, 96, 108, 135, 137, 226, 230, 254, 272, 276, 313, 316, 366
 Zeus-Hades, *see* Zeus
Harpies, 240
Harpocrates, 110, hymn 5 *passim*, *see also* Horus the child
 epithets, hymn 5 *passim*
 oracular, 338
Harris magical papyrus, 36, 38, 272, 367
Hathor, 287, 289, 294
 epithets, 336
 Isis-Hathor, *see* Isis, Isis-Hathor
 Seven Hathors, 342
 use of the name, 382

INDEXES

- headless god, 99, 169, 175, 238
- Hecate, 10, 106, 276, 353, 364, 379,
381–2, 386, 388–9, 392,
hymns **10, 11, 12, 13, 14**
and **15** *passim* (especially
commentary to **10.3–5**)
- Anatolian, 224, 259, 269, 292, 316,
372, 378
- Enodia, 227
- epithets, 195, 197, hymns **10, 11,**
12, 13, 14 and **15** *passim*
- Hecate's suppers, 223–4, 241, 333
- Hecate-Artemis, *see* Aremis-Hecate
- Hecate-Hermes, *see* Hermes,
Hermes-Hecate/
Hermecate
- Hecate-Selene, 198, 200, 229, 236,
292, hymns **11, 12, 13, 14**
and **15** *passim*
- Hekataia, 231, 306, 327
- in curses, 340
- in divination spells, 342
- in erotic magic, 341
- magical hymns to, 51, 343, hymns
10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and **15**
- myth, 35, 225
- OH* to, *see under Orphic Hymns (HH)*
- Orphic, 231–2
- possibly identified with Isis-Hathor,
369–79
- use of the name, 343–4, 385
- Helios, 69, 84, 115, 140, 166, 191, 202,
225, 292, 355, 364, 380, 389,
hymns **2, 3, 4** and **7** *passim*
- epithets, 64, 73, 255, 351, hymns **2,**
3, 4 and **7** *passim*
- Helios-Apollo, *see* Apollo-Helios
- Helios-Osiris, 276
- magical hymns to, 51, 59, hymns
2, 3, 4 and **7**
- son of Hyperion, 110, 126, 182
- use of the name, 343
- Hellenization, 4, 9, 11, 18–19, 25,
346, 365, 367, 380, 391
- Hephaestus, 83, 182, 332
- Hera, 10
- epithets, 181, 320
- OH* to, *see under Orphic Hymns (HH)*
- Hermes, 67, 226, 274–5, 293
- chthonic, 227, 315
- in curses, 340
- epithets, 64, 127, 133, 179, 240, 263
- Hermanubis, 260
- Hermes-Hecate/Hermecate,
259–60, 374, 384
- Hermes-Thoth, 251, 260, 264, 278
- HH* to, *see under Homeric Hymns (HH)*
- magical hymns to, 51, 390
- semen of, 270
- Hermetic literature, 109, 140, 142,
148, 182, 204, 210–11
- Hieratic, 5, 11, 21, 37
- hk3*/Heka, 17–19, 41
- Heka (god), 18, 388
- Homer, 69, 89, 135, 173, 186, 239, 257
- Homeric epithets, 63, 108, 112,
171, 179, 182, 186, 259,
263, 314, 320, 326
- concluding remarks, 345–9
- Homeric verses, 29–30, 70, 127,
158, 182, 184, 194, 212,
240, 286, 343
- examples in the magical hymns,
69, 83, 157, 167, 180, 194,
199, 319, 332, 366
- Homeric vocabulary, 93, 103, 110,
126, 134, 165, 172, 174, 180,
186, 190, 200, 263, 286,
314, 329
- concluding remarks, 345–9, 363
- Homeric Hymns (HH)*, 33, 185, 287
- to Aphrodite, 291
- to Apollo, 71, 102, 170, 186, 196
- to Demeter, 126, 225, 231, 263, 319

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- to Gaea, 291, 330
- to Hermes, 44, 172, 179
- to Selene, 255
- to the Mother of gods, 259
- Homeromanteia*, 171, 182, 194, 338
- horse/mare, 78, 185, 314, 317, 327, 376
 - in iconography, 229
 - symbolism, 267–8
- Horus, 41, 185, 197, 364, 374–5,
 - hymns **2** and **5** *passim*
- cippi, 49
- epithets, 65, 125, hymns **2** and **5** *passim*
- falcon, 304–5
- Harsomtut, 110, 155
- Horus the child, 49, 110
- Horus' eye/Re's eye, 129–30, 154, 274
 - in curses, 340
- magical hymns to, 59, hymns **2** and **5**
- myth, 9, 340
- son of Osiris and Isis, 9, 387
- use of the name, 381–2
- hymns
 - Egyptian, 35–47, 70, 111, 116, 122, 130, 161–2, 205, 211, 356, 359, 363, 390, *see also* hymns under Amun(-Re), Ptah, Re and Sobek
 - from the temple at Hibis, *see* Amun(-Re), hymns
 - Greek, 32–4, 39–41, 71–2, 141, 153, 172, 199, 354, 390, *see also* hymns under Apollo and Tyche, Isis hymns and aretalogies, *Homeric Hymns* and *Orphic Hymns*
 - Near-Eastern, 30–1, 40–1, 355
- hypomnēsis, 40, 172–4, 189, 199–200, 316, 354
- Iao, 34, 67, 70, 78, 114, 195, 197, 363
- Isidorus of Narmuthis, 37, 123, 143, 147, 181, 206, 215, 332, 349
- Isis, 8–10, 107, 219, 236, 266, 276, 278, 291, 384, 388
 - black cloth of, 98, 290
 - daughter of Thoth, 264
 - epithets, 133, 235, 261–2, 316, 318, 332, 349
 - goddess of magic, 264, 376, 382, 387
 - hymns and aretalogies, 37–8, 206, 215, 369–77
 - in curses, 340
 - Isis-Hathor, 10, 289, 292, 296–7, 335, 364
 - possibly identified with Hecate, 369–79
 - Isis-Tyche, 235, 370
 - myth, 49, 109, 196
 - oracular, 338
 - temple at Philae, 7, 37
 - use of the name, 381–2
- inx/rhombus*, 238, 265, 275, 278, 288, 378
- Judeo-Christian
 - Christian God, 64, 111, 131, 338
 - epithets, 64, 73, 92, 132, 144, 179, 184, 186, 212
 - concluding remarks, 349–51
 - God, 65, 96, 115, 132, 205, 363, 367
 - Jewish God, 64, 67, 69, 78–9, 82, 133, 136, 164, 166, 197, 213, 367, 380
 - literature, 106, 121, 123, 134, 141, 145, 181, 205, 208, 330, 379
 - religious tradition, 21, 66, 114, 138, 144, 189, 212–16, 331, 380, 382

INDEXES

- Judeo-Christian (cont.)
 vocabulary, 67, 81–2, 109, 149,
 188, 391
 concluding remarks, 349–51,
 363–4
- key, 230, 275
- Khepri, 52, 124, 167, 304
- Khnum, 123, 205
- laurel, 59, 71, 134, 169, 175, 366
 in Apollonian divination, 135, 173,
 178–9, 189, 194, 368, *see*
also Daphne/laurel and
 Apollo, oracles
- Leto, 171, 358
- light (divine)
 light/fire (solar symbolism), 46,
 70, 95, 103, 112, 121, 126,
 144, 157, 161, 164, 182, 185,
 206, 215, 284, 293, 384
 light/flame of torches (lunar and/
 or chthonic symbolism),
 226, 250, 254–5, 268, 276,
 290, 307
- lion, 48, 156–7, 214, 256, 267, 270, 293
 in iconography, 77, 80, 153, 166,
 328
 symbolism (Egyptian), 46, 154–7,
 160, 166–7, 358, 376, 384
 symbolism (Greek), 153–4, 259, 269
- lotus flower, 110–11, 155, 159–60,
 166–7, 384
- lunar deity, hymn **11** *passim*
 Egyptian, 201, 260, 278, 341, 386
 Greek, 201, 229, 278, 289, 294,
 306, 318, 327
- magical
 compulsion, 14, 151, 169, 175, 180,
 219, 238, 253, 272–3, 275,
 298
 ingredients, 269–72, 303–5
 material, 86
 naming, 22, 44–5, 52, 66, 74, 276
 repetition, 172, 230, 333
 threatening, 22, 243, hymn **11**
passim, especially
 commentary to lines 68–73
- magical hymns
 Apollonian hymns, 346–68,
 379–85
 deities (general), 363–79, 386–92
 divine personas, 337–92
 features, 15, 25–38
 lunar hymns, 347–65, 369–85
 possible compilers, 379–85
 ritual embedded in, 360–2
 solar hymns, 346–68, 379–85
- magical papyri
 features, 14–15, 19–24
 textual history, 22–4
- Medea, 238, 259, 388
- Min, 49, 377
- Moirai, 90–1, 109, 187, 368
 Atropos, 90
 Clotho, 90, 251
 epithets, 231, 315–16
 in connection with hymns to the
 female deity, 222, 235, 242,
 252, 257, 315, 327, 334,
 369, 377
 Lachesis, 90
OH to, *see under Orphic Hymns (OH)*
- Montu, 212
- moon (astral body), 148, 164, 223,
 234, 250, 254, 256, 259,
 265, 275, 288, 305–6, 326
- Mormo, 258, 267, 320, 335
- Mother Goddess (Anatolian), 224, 259,
 262, 269, 292, 306, 372, 379
- Mother of the gods
 epithets, 179
HH to, *see under Homeric Hymns (HH)*

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Nature, 71, 82, 120, *see also*
 Aphrodite-Gaea-Nature
 epithets, 257, 314, 332, 349
 OH to, *see under Orphic Hymns (HH)*
necromancy, 60, 86, 89, 97, 108, 113,
 337, 343
Nefertem, 155, 160
Nemesis, 235
number four, 107, 143, 185
 cardinal points, 47, 108, 175, 208,
 294
 four elements of nature, *see*
 elements of nature
 four regions of the cosmos, *see*
 regions of the cosmos
 in connection with Hecate, 229,
 293, 296, 373
 in iconography, 293
 in lunar symbolism, 294, 297, 336
 in solar symbolism, 43, 46
 symbolism (Egyptian), 47, 107–8,
 294
 tetragrammaton, 69, 197
number seven
 planets, 68, 81, 124, 133, 138, 186
 vowels, 133, 137
number three
 Greek female triple deities, 90, 186,
 222, 232, 236, 263, 327, 370
 in connection with Hecate, 226,
 231, 236, 275, 284–5,
 294–5, 329, 371
 in Hecate's iconography, 228–9,
 284, 322
 three regions of the cosmos,
 225, 228, 292
 in iconography, 153, 254, 293
 in lunar symbolism (Greek), 229,
 237, 251, 275, 284, 294,
 297, 327, 371
 in solar symbolism, 46, 90, 166, 185
 regions of the cosmos, 85, 291
Nun, 85, 95, 123, 125, 146, 155, 207
Nyx, 331, 333, 353
oracles
 Egyptian, 8, 338–9, *see also*
 Amun(-Re), oracles of, **I**
 n.410 and **Concl.** n.7
 Greek, *see* Apollo, oracles
Orphic
 literature, 72, 106, 184, 315
 mythology, 76, 81, 83–4, 153, 313,
 332
Orphic Hymns (OH), 33, 82, 106, 349,
 378
 epithets, 112, 179, 186, 210, 257,
 259, 263, 314, 317, 327, 332
 concluding remarks, 351–4
 to Aphrodite, 291, 352
 to Artemis, 352–3, 378
 to Gaea, 291, 330, 334
 to Hecate, 293, 295, 328, 332, 352,
 378
 to Hera, 332
 to Nature, 288, 291, 329, 352
 to Persephone, 378
 to Persephone/Core, 352
 to Prothyraia, 231, 352
 to Selene, 352, 378
 to the Moirai, 129, 353
 to Tyche, 235
 vocabulary, 83, 108, 129, 240, 320,
 326, 331–2, 390
 concluding remarks, 351–4, 363
Osiris, 9, 11, 81, 84, 107, 110, 242,
 278, 341, 375, 387, 389
 epithets, 65, 149
 in curses, 340
 myth, 9, 109, 196, 290, 340
ouroboros, 48, 78, 81, 91, 202
Paian, 34, 63, 81, 368
Pan, 231, 377

INDEXES

- Pan (cont.)
 epithets, 181, 210
 myth, 306
 seed of, 270
 pantheistic trigrams, 166–8
parallelismus membrorum, 44, 274, 355,
 357, 359, 363
PDM, see Demotic, magical papyri
 Peitho/Persuasion, 239, 288, 377
 Persephone/Core, 9, 52, 206, 254,
 257, 262, 270, 276, 292,
 364, hymns **10**, **12**, **14** and
15 *passim*
 epithets, 126, 195, 349, hymns **10**,
12, **14** and **15** *passim*
 in curses, 339
 magical hymns to, 52, hymns **10**,
12, **14** and **15**
 mysteries, 35
 myth, 35, 126, 225, 275
OH to, see under *Orphic Hymns (OH)*
 Phanes/Protogonus, 76, 84, 153
 Phthonus, 222, 242
 polymorphic deities, 47–50, 71, 390
 Bes-Pantheos, 48, 77, 81, 124, 156,
 168, 368
 Tutu-Tithoes, 49, 156
 polyptoton, 45, 130–1, 355, 357, 359,
 363
 Poseidon
 epithets, 64, 182
 myth, 267
 Prädikationsart
 dynamische, 41, 354, 356–7, 363
 essentielle, 41, 355, 357–8, 363–4
 primeval mound, 125, 146, 207
 Proteus, 157, 166, 346
 Prothyraia
 epithets, 317
OH to, see under *Orphic Hymns (OH)*
 Ptah, 105, 129, 160, 185
 epithets, 92, 156, 205
 hymns, 77, 107, 161–2, 207
 Python, 196, 358, 368
 ram/ewe, 46–7, 166–7
 Re, 52, 105, 110, 129, 167, 274, 384,
 387
 epithets, 104, 126, 148
 hymns, 207
 Re-Horakhty, 342
 Re-Osiris, 276
 regions of the cosmos, 121, 146–8
 ritual specialists/experts, 15, 19, 23,
 25, 338, 380, 391
 Sarapis, 8–10, 80, 104, 388
 epithets, 64, 127
 oracular, 75–6, 338
 Zeus-Helios-Sarapis, 84
 scarab, 41, 46, 110, 154, 164, 304–5
 epithet, 30, 38, 126, 156, 364
 symbolism, 124–5, 166–7, 358, 384
 seal of God, 78, 136
 Sekhmet, 154, 160, 269, 293
 in curses, 340
 Selene, 10, 144, 194, 200, 202, 229,
 377, hymns **11**, **12**, **13**, **14**
 and **15** *passim*
 epithets, 182, 194, 197, 352, hymns
11, **12**, **13**, **14** and **15** *passim*
HH to, see under *Homeric Hymns (HH)*
 magical hymns to, 51, hymns **11**,
12, **13**, **14** and **15**
OH to, see under *Orphic Hymns (OH)*
 Septuagint, 64, 72, 79, 132, 181, 205,
 214
 serpent, 36, 124, 158, 205, 214, 256,
 285
 Apophis, see Apophis
 in iconography, 70, 80, 154, 166,
 232
 of female Greek deities, 229,
 232, 268, 328, 334, 357, 377

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Python, *see* Python
- symbolism (Egyptian), 110–11, 154, 157, 166–7, 358, 384
- symbolism (Greek), 153–4
- Seth
 - god of the winds, 195
 - myth, 109, 340
- snḏ* exhortations, 73, 122–3
- Sobek, 8, 147
 - epithets, 156
 - hymns, 163
 - oracular, 338
- solar god (general), 104, 133–4, 181
- solar god (Greek), 69, 96, 185–6, 190
 - Apollo-Helios, *see* Apollo, Apollo-Helios
 - Helios, *see* Helios
- solar-creator god (Egyptian), 73–4, 92, 104–5, 116, 367, 379, 383, *see also* Amun(-Re), theology
- cosmic god, 46–50, 74–9, 82, 108, 133, 137, 188, 387–8
- cosmic nourisher, 46, 107, 130, 137, 142–3, 160–3, 207, 211
- life-giving elements
 - light, *see* light (divine), light/fire (solar symbolism)
 - water/saliva, *see* water, water/saliva
 - wind/breath, *see* wind, wind/breath
- manifestations, 41–3, 46, 51–2, 145, 198, 319
 - child, 110, 160, 166, *see also* Horus the child
 - lion, *see* lion, symbolism (Egyptian)
 - lotus, *see* lotus flower
 - ram, *see* ram/ewe
 - scarab, *see* scarab
 - serpent, *see* serpent, symbolism (Egyptian)
 - primordial god, 46, 74, 93–4, 146, 155, 164
 - solar god, 46, 70–1, 84, 87, 95, 109, 113, 121, 185, 340, 375
- Sothis/Sirius, 9, 375, 387
- spells
 - curse, 337, 361
 - divination, 59, 117, 337–9
 - dream oracle, 38, 64, 85, 90, 97, 115, 169, 172, 175, 191, 195, 197, 280, 337
 - love spell of attraction, 97, 219, 238–40, 280, 288, 337, 341–3, 361
 - slander, 32, 280, hymn **13** *passim*
- Sphinx, 153, 273
 - sphinx-ape, 271, 273
- Stoic conceptions, 75, 94, 105, 157, 330
- Tartarus, 254, 272, 275, 333, 378
- Tefnut, 154
- Tethys, 272
- theology
 - of Heliopolis, 79
 - of Hermopolis, 95, 110, 146, 339
 - solar, *see* solar-creator god (Egyptian), solar god
 - Theban, *see* Amun(-Re), theology
- Thoth, 91, 260, 278, 341, 374, 384, 386, 390
 - baboon, 306
 - epithets, 127, 148
 - father of Isis, 264
 - god of magic, 382, 387
 - ibis, 304
 - myth, 49, 129
 - Thoth-Hermes, *see* Hermes-Thoth
- Titans, 126, 182, 224, 272, 332, 364

INDEXES

- Tyche, 235, 307, 315, 327, 369
 epithets, 316
 hymns to, 331
OH to, *see under Orphic Hymns (OH)*
- Typhon-Seth, 74, 196, 230
 epithets, 133
 god of the winds, 195
 magical hymns to, 51
 Typhon, 196
- Underworld
 Egyptian, 88–9, 95, 108, 121, 136,
 232, 254, 285
 Greek, 84–5, 134–5, 253–4, 285,
 330, 378
 chaos, *see* chaos
 Erebus, *see* Erebus
 Hades, *see* Hades, place
- uraeus, 48, 77, 95, 154, 157, 293, 376
- Uranus, 106, 225
- Venus (planet), 289, 297, 326
voces magicae, 14, 21–2, 28, 56, 66, 166,
 174, 201, 241, 276, 333,
 349, 360, 380, 382
 analysed, *see the* Index of Greek
 words
 in the description of spells, 140,
 169, 175, 202, 243, 298,
 309
 palindrome, 90, 109, 333
 with visual impact, 172
- words used as, 52, 166, 196–7, 199,
 368, 380
- water
 element of nature, *see* elements of
 nature
 goddess of, *see* Tethys
 primordial, 85, 105, 110, 113, 146,
 150, 208, 272, *see also* Nun
 water/saliva, 46, 77, 160–3, 187
- wind
 god of, *see* Amun(-Re), Apollo,
 Seth, Typhon-Seth
 wind/breath, 46, 77, 102, 128, 141,
 160–3, 168, 187, 208, 211
- wolf, 258–9, 285, 376
- yelling, 284–6
- Zeus, 67, 114, 157, 164, 183, 219, 284,
 314, 350, 366
 epithets, 64, 73, 112, 127, 179, 183,
 187, 197, 256, 351
 in curses, 339
 myth, 102, 205, 225, 261, 272, 378
 oracular, 338
 Orphic, 75, 83, 106, 147, 153
 Stoic, 105
 use of the name, 389
 Zeus's eye, 128–9
 Zeus-Ammon, 8
 Zeus-Hades, 9, 389

INDEX OF DISCUSSED EGYPTIAN EPITHETS

- iwy-mwf*, 104
ir-pt-t3-dw3t-mw-dww, 147
ir-n'-sb3w, 148
ir-ht-nbt, 145
ir-3w, 102
ir-dt, 209
it-itw, 74, 92, 145
itn-nfr, 113
itn-n-nbw, 113
3-nbt-n-izbt-nt-pt, 126
3-nsr-n-m'ndt, 126
3-šyt, 73
nh-hrw-m-3wt.f, 112
š3-mw, 319
š3-hprw, 198, 318
w', 209
w'-ir.n.f-sw-m-hlw, 143
w'-ir-sw-m-hlw, 143
w'-w'w, 209
wbn-m-nbw, 112
wn.ty.fy-n-dt, 82
wr-m-pt, 187
wsr-ib, 181
w3d-sb3w.f, 148
psd-m-nbw, 112
ms-ntt(-nbt), 73
ms-sw-(ds.f), 111
nb, 64
nb-pt-t3-dw3t, 84
nb-pt-t3-dw3t-3w-mw-Nwn-h3swt, 147
nb-nhh-ir-dt, 209
nb-nhh-dt, 82
nb/nsw-nhh, 82
nb/nsw-dt, 82
nb r-dr, 109, 133
nb-snd, 73
nb-3w, 102
nn-wrd-n.f, 104
nhh, 82
nsw-bity-i.hmw-wrd, 149
nsw-n-pt-ir-sb3w.s, 148
nfr-w', 209
nfr-nfrw, 146
hry-tp-i.hmw-sk, 149
hpr-m-sp-tpy, 164
hpr n hpr hprw nb, 130
hpr hprw nb m-ht hpr.f, 130
hpr-ds.f, 93, 111, 164
swt-mn-m-ht-nbt, 102
sm3w, 93
shd-t3wy, 112
shd-t3wy-m-stwt.f, 113
sdm sprw, 185
š3y-m-'.s, 370
š3y-rrt-m-wdt.n.s, 370
km3-pt-t3-(dw3t)-mw-dww, 207
km3-ntt, 73, 145
km3-ht-n-nh, 207
kd/nhp-rmt-'.wt-nbt, 205
3w, 102
3w-ndm, 102
dt, 82

INDEX LOCORUM

Apart from the discussed magical hymns (and the spells that contain them) and other lengthy extracts, this index also includes some sources that are quoted more than once (even if briefly, within the text and sometimes only in translation) owing to their importance within the discussion.

- Eur. *Hipp.*
 447–8: 291, 329
- Hom. *Od.*
 4.456–8: 157–8
 11.109: 70, 134, 184, 384
- Homeric Hymns, see under* Index of subjects, *Homeric Hymns (HH)*
- Hymns from the temple at Hibis
 I.6: 144, 162
 I.10–13: 156
 II.5–7: 125, 146
 II.23–4: 208
 II.24–5: 143
 II.25–6: 211
 III.5–6, 41: 77
 IV.5: 148
 IV.12: 130
 IV.15–16: 205
 IV.17–8: 143
 IV.26–7: 71
 IV.28–9: 208
 IV.29: 148
 VI.21: 160
- Isidorus, *Hymns*
 2.3: 206
 2.11–12: 147
 4.1–2, 29–30: 215
 4.25: 143
 4.27–8: 123
- LXX, *Jb.*
 34.13: 214
 38.4–5, 7, 14, 17, 25–8, 33–4, 39–40: 214
- 38.14.1: 205
- Orph. fr.
 31, 243: 75, 83, 106, 147
 378: 72, 79
- Orphic Hymns, see under* Index of subjects, *Orphic Hymns (OH)*
- P. Berlin 3048
 III.1: 107
 III.8: 161
 III.10: 162
 V.4: 77
 V.7–8: 163
 VI.2–3: 161, 163
 IX.3: 209
 X.4: 207
 XII.2: 162
- P. Berlin 3049
 XIII.5: 131
 XVII.6: 70
- P. Brooklyn 47.218.156
 2.1: 143
 4.3–5: 77, 94, 143, 148, 168
- P. Cairo 58032
 5–6: 130
 12: 136
 14–15: 104
 29: 107
 30–1: 105, 107
- P. Chester Beatty IV
 rto 3.7: 206, 215
- P. Insinger
 24, 31.20–24–32.1–5: 215

INDEX LOCORUM

- P. Leiden I 350
 IV.8: 206
 IV.17-18: 145
 IV.20-1: 136
 V.12-14: 122
 V.20-1: 206
- PGM I*
 296-327 and 341-7 = hymn **1**:
 59
- PGM II*
 1-64: 169
 2-7 = hymn **6**: 169
 64-183: 52, 175
 81-102 = hymn **7**: 175
- PGM III*
 187-262: 117
 198-230 = hymn **3**: 117
 494-611: 140
 549-58 = hymn **4**: 140
- PGM IV*
 296-466: 97
 436-61 = hymn **2A**: 97
 930-1114: 151
 939-48 = hymn **5**: 151
 1390-495: 219
 1399-434 = hymn **10**: 219
 1928-2005: 98
 1957-89 = hymn **2B**: 97
 2241-358: 243
 2242-347 = hymn **11**: 243
 2441-621: 280
 2455-63: 303
 2522-67 = hymn **12**: 280
 2574-610 = hymn **13A**: 298
 2622-707: 52, 298
 2643-74 = hymn **13B**: 298
 2708-84: 52, 309
 2714-83 = hymn **14**: 309
 2785-890: 52, 322
 2786-870 = hymn **15**: 322
- PGM VI*
 1-47: 52, 191
 6-45 = hymn **8**: 191
 25-7: 169
- PGM VIII*
 64-110: 98
 74-81 = hymn **2C**: 97
- PGM XII*
 201-69: 202
 238-44: 136-7, 143-4, 216
 244-52 = hymn **9**: 202
- PGM XIII*
 62-4: 144-5
- Plato
Lg. 909a-d: 17
Resp. 364b-e: 17
- Tura hymn
 4: 105
 9: 113
 13: 143
- Ushtavaiti Gatha 44
 3-5: 212-13

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

Inflected forms are listed according to the order in which they appear in the hymns and subsequently grouped according to their cases and similar phrase patterns.

- ἀβρόνους: ἀβρονόη 12.22.
 ἄβυσσος: ἄβυσσῳ 1.33; ἄβυσσον
 4.5, 15.34.
 ἄγαλμα: ἄγαλμα 15.3.
 ἄγαν: 12.27.
 ἄγγελος: ἄγγελε 1.5; ἄγγελον 3.14.
 ἅγιος: ἅγια 1.18; ἁγία 4.1; ἁγίου
 πνεύματος 4.1; ἅγιε 9.11; ἁγία
 11.40, 12.25.
 ἀγκαλίζομαι: ἡγκαλισμένη 11.36.
 ἀγλαός: ἀγλαή 11.39.
 ἀγρίοθυμος: ἀγρίοθυμοι 15.19.
 ἄγριος: ἄγρια 14.14.
 ἀγύναιος: ἀγύναιοι 14.13.
 ἄγω: ἄγων 5.5; δεῦρ' ἅ[γ]ε, δεῦρο
 6.2; δεῦρ' ἅγε 6.3, 8.18; δεῦρ'
 ἅγε, δε[ῦρο] 8.17; ἄξατε 10.13.
 ἀγωγή: ἀγωγής 12.18.
 ἀδάμας: ἀδάμαντος 14.5.
 ἀδαμάστωρ: ἀδαμάστωρ 14.3.
 ἀδίδακτος: ἀδίδακτος 3.25.
 ἄδμητος: Στυγὸς ἀδ[μήτοιο] πύλας
 3.28; ἀδμήτη 14.3.
 αἰίδω: αἰείσασθαι 8.34.
 ἀέναιος: ἀέναιον 15.37.
 ἀέξω: φῶσιν ἀέζοντα 3.19.
 ἀέριος: ἀέριοι 4.8.
 ἀεροειδής: ἀεροειδῆ 7.35.
 ἀεροφοιτήτος: ἀεροφοιτήτων 2.1.
 ἀήρ: ἀέρα 4.6, 15.21; ἀέρι 9.14.
 ἀθάνατος: θεὸν] ἀθάνατόν 3.10;
 ἀθανάτων 3.20, 24; ἀθάναντ'
 3.21; ἀθάνατο 3.30, 12.13, 15.30;
 εἷς θεὸς ἀθάνατος 9.5.
 ἀθέμιστος: >ἀθέμιτον 13.19A.
 ἄθεσμος: ἄθεσμον 13.25A–B;
 ἄθεσμα 13.27B.
 ἀθρέω: ἄθρησον 11.53.
 αἰγλήεις: αἰγλήεις 7.16.
 Ἄιδης: Ἄιδος 1.21, 35, 2.8; Ἄ(ι)δην
 11.73.
 Ἀἰδωναία: Ἀἰδωναία 14.9, 15.47.
 αἰζήος: αἰζηή 11.40.
 αἰθέριος: αἰθερίοισι 2.3; αἰθέριε
 3.17.
 αἰθήρ: αἰθέρος 3.2.
 αἶθρη: αἶθραν 3.5; αἶθρα(ν) 4.6.
 αἶμα: αἶμα 11.61, 13.2A–B, 13.9B,
 13.15A–B, 13.18A–B.
 αἵματοπῶτις: >αἱμοπότι 15.53.
 αἶξ: α[ιγ]ῶν 8.29; αἰγός 13.2A–B.
 αἰολοθώρηξ: αἰολοθώρηξ 7.17.
 αἰπός: καίπῃ 11.25.
 αἰρέω: ἐλεῖν 13.17B.
 αἶω: αἶοντα 3.6.
 αἰών/Αἰών: αἰῶνά τε πάντων 1.15;
 Αἰὼν Αἰ(ῶ)να τρέφων Αἰῶσιν
 ἀνάσσει 9.4; Αἰώνων βασιλεῦ
 9.7; Αἰὼν 11.71.
 αἰώνιος: θεὸν αἰώνιον 1.15; αἰωνία
 12.36; αἰών(ι)ε 15.36.
 ἀκάμας: ἀκάμας 7.18.
 ἀκάματος: ἀκάματον πῦρ 2.2, 12.5,
 15.26.
 ἀκίχητος: ἀκίχητε 7.16.
 ἀκμαῖος: ἀκμαῖε δὲ λέων 5.1.
 ἀκοίμητος: ἀκοιμήτου πυρός
 2.24A.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- ἀκούω: ἀκο[ύει 3.31; ἀκούων 7.19;
 ἀκούση 7.25, 11.4; ἀκουσον
 11.48, 88; ἀκούειν 11.79;
 ἀκούοντα 12.10; ἀκούοντες
 12.17.
 ἀκραῖος: ἀκρίη 11.35.
 ἀκτινοχαῖτις: ἀκτινοχαῖτι 11.44.
 ἀκτίς: ἀκτίνων 2.25A; ἀκτίνας 11.37.
 ἄλγος: ἄλγη 13.14A.
 ἀλήθεια: ἀληθείην 1.25.
 ἀληθής: θε[σ]πίσματ' ἀληθῆ 6.8.
 ἄλιος: ἄλιοςιο 3.3.
 ἄλκιμος: ἀλκίμη 11.28.
 ἄλλά: 1.28, 2.18B, 14.23; ἄλλ' 1.37.
 ἀλλοιόμορος: ἀλλοιόμοροι 10.10.
 ἄλλος: ἄλλον 14.19.
 ἄλλως: 13.23B.
 ἄλς: ἄλα 13.6A; ἄλας 13.6B.
 ἄλυτος: ἄλυτου 14.5; ἄλυτους 15.38.
 ἄλφитον: ἄλφита 13.7A; ἄλφитον
 13.9A; ἄλφίτους 13.4B.
 ἄλως: ἄλωος 14.24.
 ἁμαράντινος: τὰμαράντιν' 13.11A.
 ἁμβρόσιος: ἁμβροσίων στομάτων
 7.6; ἁμβροσίου στομάτιο
 7.10, 30.
 ἁμβροτος: ἁμβροτε 11.29.
 ἁμφί: ἁμφί 7.26.
 ἁμφιβαίνω: ἁμφιβέ[βηκ]ας 8.21.
 ἁμφίδρομος: ἁμφίδρομοι 3.2.
 ἁμφιελίσσω: ἁμφιελίσσων 2.3.
 ἁμφιέπω: ἁμφιέπουσα 15.29.
 ἁμφιθέω: ἁμφιθέων 7.19.
 ἁμφιπολεύω: ἁμφιπολεύεις 15.34.
 ἁμφιχαράσσω: ἁμφεχάραξεν 15.40.
 ἄν: ὅπως ἄν 1.18; εὐτ' ἄν 7.25;
 ἄχρις ἄν 10.28.
 ἀναγκάζω: ἀναγκάσης 11.75, 78;
 ἀναγκάσει 13.28B.
 ἀνάγκη: ἀνάγκης 1.23, 2.13, 11.68,
 14.35; ἀνάγκη(ς) 11.84.
 ἀναθρόσκω: ἀναθρόσκων 5.3.
 ἀνάκτωρ: μολπῆς κύδιμ' ἀνάκτωρ
 7.7.
 ἀνακυκλέω: ἀνακυκλεῖται 12.26.
 ἀναλαμβάνω: ἀναλάβης 11.9.
 ἄναξ: ἄναξ Ἀπόλλων 1.1; ἄναξ
 2.21B; ἄναξ κόσμοιο 3.22; ἄναξ
 σκηπτοῦχος 7.3; ἄναξ μολπῆς
 7.7; see also ἀνάκτωρ.
 ἄνασσα: ἄνασσα 11.39, 12.38.
 ἀνάσσω: Ἰφι ἀνάσσεις 8.22; Αἰῶσιν
 ἀνάσσει 9.4; ἀνάσσεις 12.6,
 15.27, 35.
 ἀναστατώω: ἀναστατοῦσα 11.3.
 ἀνατέλλω: ἀντέλλοντα 1.17;
 ἀνατείλας 3.13; ἀνατέλλοντος
 7.12.
 ἀναυδάω: ἀναυδήσασα 12.9.
 ἀναφαίνω: ἀνέφηνεν 7.2.
 ἀνδρεῖος: ἀνδρείη 11.33.
 ἀνέκλειπτος: ἀνέκλ(ε)πτον 11.74.
 ἄνεμος: ἀνέμων 2.1, 14.15; ἀνέμους
 9.3.
 ἀνήρ: ἀνδρῶν 14.33, 15.32.
 ἄνθρωπος: ἀνθρώποισι 1.29, 2.18A,
 21B; [ἀνθρώ]ποις 3.11; ἀνθρώπων
 2.9; ἄνθρωποι 12.13; ἄνθρωπὸν
 13.15A–B.
 ἀνήμε: ἀνιεῖσα 15.12.
 ἀνοίγω: ἡνέωγε 11.20; ἡνοιξα 11.50.
 ἀνόσιος: ἀνοσίας 10.12.
 ἀντιβολέω: ἀντεβόλησεν 7.23.
 ἀντίος: ἀντία 1.26, 2.16.
 ἀντίχειρ: ἀντίχειρά 11.84.
 ἀντολίη/Ἀντολίη: ἀντολῆς 1.8,
 3.16; δέσποτα ἀν[τολῆς] 3.13;
 ἀντολίῃσιν 3.23; Ἀντολίη 7.22.
 ἀντολίηθε(ν): ἀντολίηθεν 1.9.
 ἄνω: ἄνω{θεν} 11.79.
 ἄνωθεν: 11.79.
 ἀξιόω: ἀξιῶ 1.2.
 αἰοδή: αἰοδᾶς 7.2; αἰοδᾶς 7.6; ἱερῆς
 ἐπάκουσον αἰοδῆς 7.4.

- ἄπαις: ἄπαιδες 14.13.
 ἄπας: ἄπαν 1.28, 2.18B, 13.17A–B;
 ἄπαντα 2.4, 6, 4.9, 9.12, 11.67.
 ἀπείριτος: ἀπείριτον 15.34.
 ἀπέρχομαι: ἀπέλθεις 1.36.
 ἀπηγής: ἀπηγῶς 13.14A.
 ἀπό: 1.24, 2.14, 10.24, 12.28; ἀπ' 1.7,
 2.25A, 7.5, 10, 11.55.
 ἀπότροπος: ἀπότροπε 6.2.
 ἀποφθίνω: ἀποφθιμένοις 14.12.
 ἄπτω: ἄπτομαι 11.52.
 ἀπωθέω: ἀπωσάσθω 14.20.
 ἀργυρότοξος: ἀργυρό[τοξ]ε 8.21.
 ἀρηγός: ἀρηγέ 11.39.
 ἀρίς: ἀρίς 11.64.
 ἄριστος: ἄρ[ιστοι] 3.30.
 ἀρκευθίνος: ἀρκευθίνοις 13.11B.
 ἄρκιος: ἄρκιον 1.28.
 ἄρμα: ἄρμασιν 15.5.
 ἄρρηκτος: ἄρρηκτους 15.38.
 ἄρρητος: ἄρρητος 3.8.
 ἀρσενόθηλος: ἀρσενόθηλον 13.28A.
 ἄρτιος: ἄρτιον 2.18B.
 ἀρχαῖος: ἀρχαίτατον 12.12.
 ἀρχή: φυσικαὶ πυρὸς ἀρχαί 5.1;
 ἀρχή 15.35.
 ἀρχηγέτης: ἀρχηγέτης 11.46; θεῶν
 ἀρχηγέτη 11.86.
 ἀρωγός: ἀ[ρ]ωγόν 3.17.
 ἄρωμα: ἄρωμα 12.1, 15.45.
 ἀσεβής: ἀσεβοῦς 10.12.
 ἀστερόεις: ἀστερόεντα 12.14.
 ἀστερόφοιτος: ἀστερόφοιτος 12.26.
 ἀστήρ: ἀστέρες 4.8; ἀστήρ 11.59;
 ἀστράσιν 15.7.
 ἄστοχος: ἀστό{ι}χοις 11.3.
 ἀστραπή: ἀστραπή 11.58.
 ἀστροδίδος: ἀστροδία 12.32.
 ἀστυφέλικτος: ἀστυφέλικτε 7.16.
 ἀτάσθαλος: ἀτασθάλη 11.43.
 ἄτε: ἄτ' 15.21.
 ἄτεφρος: ἄτεφρον 13.7A–B.
 ἀτμός: ἀτμῶ 9.14 (πυρὸς ἀτμῶ).
 ἄτονος: ἀτόνων 12.8.
 ἀτρύγετος: ἀτρυγέτος 12.15.
 ἀτυχής: ἥρωες ἀτυχεῖς 10.9, 19.
 αὐγάζω: αὐγάζουσα 12.31.
 αὐγή: αὐγή 11.2, 24.
 αὐθις: α[ὐ]θις 3.19.
 αὐξάνω: αὐξεται 11.103; αὐξῆς
 12.27.
 αὖρα: αὖραις 2.1.
 αὖριον: 11.85.
 αὐτεξούσιος: αὐτεξούσιον 7.35.
 αὐτογένεθλος: αὐτογένεθλε 1.32,
 2.25B, 5.5.
 αὐτολόχευτος: αὐτολόχευτε 2.22A.
 αὐτομαθής: αὐτομαθής 3.25.
 αὐτός: αὐτός 1.29, 2.4, 18A, 21B,
 3.8, 5.10, 7.3, 7.8; α(ὐ)τός
 15.40; αὐταῖς 1.30, 4.9; αὐτὸ 6.5;
 αὐτοῦ 8.30, 13.16A–B; αὐτὸν
 10.8; αὐτήν 10.13; αὐτῆς 10.23,
 14.16; αὐτῇ 10.25, 28.
 αὐτοφυής: φύσιν αὐτοφυῆ 1.16;
 αὐτοφυῆς 11.33.
 ἀφαιρέω: ἀφέλεσθε 10.23, 14.16.
 ἀφθεγκτος: ἀφθεγκτα 1.4.
 ἀφθιτος: ἀφθιτε 2.10, 24A, 7.9;
 ἀφθίτη 11.40.
 ἀφρός: ἀφρὸν ἡμερον 5.4.
 ἀχεύω: ἀχνυμένη 7.23.
 ἀχρεῖος: ἀχρ(ε)ίου 11.81.
 ἄχρι: ἄχρις 10.28.
 ἄωροβόρος: ἄωροβόρε 15.54.
 ἄωρος: ἄωροις 10.2, 14.12; νύκτα
 τὴν ἄωρον 11.51; ἄωρου 13.3A–B.
 βάλλω: βαλοῦσα 13.11A.
 βαριδοῦχος: βαριδοῦχε 11.32.
 βαρύμηνης: βαρύμηνη 7.8.
 βασανίζω: βασανιζομένην 10.13.
 βάσανος: βασάνοις 10.8; βάσανος
 15.50.
 βασιλεία: βασιλεία 15.4.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- βασιλεύς: βασιλεῦ 3.9; Αἰώνων
 βασιλεῦ 9.7.
 βέλος : βέλος 11.76.
 βῆσσα: βῆσσαι 9.9.
 βιάζω: βεβιασμένον 11.72.
 βίαιος: βιαιού 4.5.
 βιόμορος: βιομόροις 10.2.
 βλέπτω: βλέψης 1.37.
 βλέπω: βλέπω σε, καὶ βλέπεις με
 11.89.
 βλέφαρον: βλεφάρων 10.24;
 βλέφαρον βλεφάρῳ 14.17.
 βλώσκω: μόλης 2.11; μόλε 7.7,
 12.25.
 βοή: βοήν 3.6.
 βολή: βολῆς 11.63.
 βουλή: βουλαῖς 4.9, 11.3.
 βούλομαι: βούλομαι 11.85; βούλει
 13.27B.
 βοῦς: βοός 11.62.
 βοῶπις: βοῶπι 14.25.
 βριμάζω: βρίμασον 11.6.
 βριμῶ/ Βριμῶ: 11.29; ἦω φορβᾶ
 Βριμῶ 11.48.
 βροτός: βροτοῖσιν 8.6.
 βύθιος: βυθία 12.36.
 βυθός: βυθός 11.94.
 βώμιος: βωμίοις 13.10B.
 βωμός: βωμόν 8.27; βωμοῖς 13.10A.
 γαῖα: γαίης 1.21, 2.8, 11, 9.9; γαῖαν
 2.25A, 4.6, 7.5, 29; γαῖα 9.14;
 γαῖα 11.102.
 γαῖοχος: Διὸς γαῖοχον ὄμμα 7.14.
 γάρ: 1.29, 2.5, 18A, 21B, 11.7, 48, 77,
 12.28, 13.15A–B, 13.28B, 15.33,
 36, 49.
 γέμω: δόλου γέμουσαν 11.45.
 γενέτειρα: γενέτειρα 15.32.
 γενέτης: καρπῶν γενέτης 9.2.
 γενέτωρ/γεννήτωρ: κόσμου
 [γενέτω]ρ 3.9; πάντων
 γεννήτωρ 9.5.
 γεννάω: γεννῶν 2.4; γεννᾷς 12.28.
 γένος: γένη 12.29; γένος 14.33.
 γεύω: γευσάμενος 7.2.
 γιγάεσσα: γιγάεσσα 14.1.
 γίγνομαι: γενοῦ 1.37; γενέσθαι
 11.15, 78, 13.10B; γ{ε}ίνεται
 11.85, 13.20B; γέννηται 11.85.
 γλαυκός: γλαυκῆς 11.65.
 γλυκός: γλυκὺν 14.16.
 γνώμη: γνώμησιν 1.25.
 γονή: γονήν 13.19A–B.
 γόνος: γόνος 11.63.
 γοργῶπις: γοργῶπι 10.5.
 γράμμα: γράμματα 2.24B, 15.40.
 γυνή: γυναικός 11.65, 13.4A;
 γυναικῶν 14.33.
 γῦψ: γῦπά 13.12A.
 δαδοῦχος: δαδοῦχε 12.32, 14.4.
 δαίδαλος: δαιδάλῃ 11.25.
 δαίμων: δαίμονα 1.22, 2.12;
 δαίμονες 2.9, 3.7, 12.16, 15.30;
 θεοὶ κ]αὶ δαίμονες 3.30; δαῖμον
 2.24A; δαίμονας 11.95; Τύχη
 θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων 13.22A–B.
 δαίς: δαῖτα 15.48.
 δαιτύς: δαιτὺν 12.19.
 δάκρυσιν: δάκρυσιν 10.7.
 δαμασάνδρα: δα]μασά[ν]δρα 8.15;
 δαμασάνδρα 15.42.
 δάμνημι: δαμνομένη 14.22, 35.
 δαμνοδαμία: δαμνοδαμία 15.42.
 δαμνομένεια: δαμνομένεια 15.42.
 δαμνώ: δαμνῶ 15.42.
 δασπλήτης: δασπλήτι 12.19, 15.48.
 δάφνη/Δάφνη: δά[φνης? 3.27;
 δάφνης 6.6; δάφνη 7.1, 8.1, 31;
 Δάφνη 8.32; δάφνην 13.7A–B.
 δάω: δαῖναι 1.29, 2.18A, 21B.
 δέ: 4.7, 5.1, 2, 7.21, 23, 9.3, 10.17,
 13.15B, 13.16B, 13.18B, 13.19A–B,
 13.27B, 14.19, 15.17, 34, 35, 41, 43;
 δ' 1.30, 2.20A, 23B, 3.21, 4.4, 7.5,

- 19, 29, 8.35; 9.1, 2, 4, 12.29,
13.14A, 13.15A, 13.21A-B, 14.18,
20, 34, 15.2, 18, 50; <δέ> 7.10;
μὲν ... δ' 14.11.
δεῖ: 11.15, 56, 78.
δεῖνα: 2.19B, 10.6, 9, 11, 12, 23, 11.7,
11, 16, 57, 80, 97, 13.1A-B,
13.11B, 13.25A-B, 14.16, 31, 34.
δεινός: δ[ε]ινὴ 8.8; δεινὴ 10.5;
δεινήν 12.17; δεινόν 13.1A;
δεινάς 14.11; δειναῖς 15.10.
δεκάς: τρισσῶν δεκάδων 12.6.
δελφίς: δελφῖνες 3.3.
Δελφίς: Δελφίδα Πυθῶ 1.3.
δέμας: δέμας 1.28, 2.18B.
δένδρεον: δένδρεον ὑψιπέτηλον
5.2; δένδρεα 12.14.
δεξιτερός: χέρα δεξιτερήν 1.13.
δέρμα: δέρμα 13.17A-B.
δεσμός: δεσμὰ 11.68; δεσμοῖς
11.83, 15.15; δεσμούς 15.38;
δεσμοῖσιν 15.51.
δέσποινα: δέσποινα 15.1.
δεσπότης: δέσποτα 1.3; δέσποτα
κόσμου 2.10, 23A; δέσποτα
ἀν[τολίνης] 3.13; δέσποτα
πάντων 9.11.
δεῦρο: δεῦρ' 1.7, 14.1, 10, 28; δεῦρ'
ἄ[γ]ε, δεῦρο 6.2; δεῦρ' ἄγε 6.3,
8.18; δεῦρ' ἄγε, δε[ῦρο] 8.17;
δεῦρ' ἴθι μοι 12.18, 23; δεῦρό μοι
4.1, 7.28, 8.34; <δεῦρο σύ> 4.2;
δεῦρο τάχος 7.29; δεῦρο 12.24.
δέω: δεθεῖσα 11.6; ἔδησα 11.83.
δή: καὶ δὴ νῦν 2.10; εἰ ποτε δὴ 6.6;
ἢ εἰ δὴ ποτέ 8.28.
διά: 1.37; δι' 7.30; διὰ τάχους 10.13.
διάδημα: διάδημα 15.37.
διαζεύγνυμι: διαζεύξασα 14.5.
διαμετρώω: διαμετρήσαντι 7.21.
διασκελίζομαι: διεσκελισμένον
11.65.
δίδωμι: ἔδωκας 2.21B; δότε 10.24;
δῶκε 15.41.
διέπω: διέπων 2.2.
διυπετής: διυπετές 7.15.
διῷστημι: διαστήσας 4.3.
διό: 12.8, 14.37.
δισύλλαβος: δισύλλαβος 5.6.
διχθάς: διχθάς 11.32.
δνοφερός: δνοφερὴ 8.35.
δολιχός: δολιχὴ 11.38.
δολόεις: δολόεσσα 11.43;
<δο>λόεσσα 14.9, 24.
δόλος: δόλου 11.45.
δονέω: δονεῖται 12.10.
δορά: δορῆς 13.17A-B.
δορυφορέω: δορυφοροῦσιν 4.9.
δουπέω: δεδουπότα 7.26.
δράκαινα: δράκαινα 11.58.
δράκων: δράκων 5.1; δρακόντων
15.14, 51.
δράω: δεδρακεῖναι 13.11B, 13.14A.
δρόμος: δρόμος 9.13; δρόμον
15.5.
δρόσος: δρόσον 11.102.
δύναμαι: δύναται 2.19B.
δύναμις: δύναμιν 1.34; δυνάμει
9.12.
δυσάλυκτος: δυσάλυκτος 15.49.
δύσις/Δύσις: δύσιν 1.9, 3.23; Δύσις
7.23.
δυστυχής: ἡρωίδες τε δυστυχεῖς
10.19.
δύω: δύνοντα 1.17.
Δωδώνιος: Δωδωνή 11.34.
ἐάν: ἦν 2.11; ἂν μὴ 11.75; κἂν 11.11,
16, 57, 80;
ἐαυτοῦ: ἐαυτοῦ 10.6.
ἐγείρω: ἐγείρει 9.2; ἔγειρε 11.22.
ἐγκατατίθημι: ἐγκαταθέσθω
14.20.
ἐγώ: μοι, 1.18, 26, 2.15, 16, 19B, 3.4,
6.8, 8.29, 11.57, 12.37, 15.55;

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- χρημάτισόν μοι 1.2; φρασάτω μοι 1.24; ὕλαθι μοι 1.32, 2.22A, 2.25B, 5.10, 15.27; δεῦρό μοι 4.1, 7.28, 8.34; δεῦρ' ἴθι μοι 12.18, 23; ἐλθέ μοι 15.1; ἐμοί 2.12, 3.9, 12.38; νεῦσον ἐμοί 5.7; <μοι> 7.5, 10; με 1.37, 14.34; βλέπεις με 11.89; κλύθι μεν 8.21; μου 10.22, 11.4, 60, 67, 77; ἐμοῦ 10.28, 14.34; ἐγώ 11.47, 13.26A-B; κἀγώ 11.89; ἐμε 14.20; ἐμοῖς 14.21.
 ἔθειρα: ἐθείραις 8.3.
 ἐθέλω: θέλω 1.25, 2.15; θέλης 11.11, 16, 57, 80.
 εἰ: 14.19; εἴ ποτε δὴ 6.6; εἴ ποτ[έ τ]οι 8.27; ἢ εἰ δὴ ποτέ 8.28; εἰ μὴ 11.85; κεῖ 14.14.
 εἰδῶλιος: εἰδωλή 11.31.
 εἰδῶλον: εἰδῶλον 14.15.
 εἰμί: ἐστίν 1.11, 12, 8.30; ἐστί 1.24, 15.36; ὄν 2.20A, 23B; ὕλαος 3.9; ὕλα{ι}ος ἔσ(σ)ο 3.16; ἐσσι ... ἔσσι 3.21; ἐὼν 3.24; εἶ 5.6, 15.8, 35; ἔσται 8.13; εἰμι 11.14; εἶναι 13.16A; ἦσ(θ)α 14.6; ἐστιν 15.19.
 εἶμι: δεῦρ' ἴθι μοι 12.18, 23.
 εἰνόδιος: εἰνοδία 10.30, 12.35, 14.8, 15.46.
 εἰς: 1.36, 2.6, 20B, 7.22, 11.53, 73, 79, 87, 99, 13.11A, 17B, 15.36; κείς 13.17A; ἐς φάος ἐλθεῖν 1.28; εἰς φάος ἐλθεῖν 2.18B.
 εἷς: ἐν 6.5; εἷς θεὸς ἀθάνατος 9.5; εἷς 11.61.
 εἰσακούω: εἰσάκουσον 15.28.
 εἰσβάλλω: εἴσβαλε 11.99.
 εἰσγηνονιδη: 4.7.
 εἰσέρχομαι: εἰσηλθας 11.96.
 εἰσorrάω: εἰσorrόωντες 2.9; εἰσorrόων 7.19.
 εἶτα: 8.19, 20, 11.89.
 ἐκ: 2.5, 3.19, 4.4, 10.6, 11.2, 15.36; (ἐξ) 4.5; ἐξ 11.103, 12.8.
 ἐκάεργος: ἐκάεργε 6.2, 8.17.
 ἐκγίγνομαι: ἐκγίνεται 13.20A.
 ἐκεῖνος: κείνον 14.20.
 ἐκπτύω: ἐκπτύσης 11.55.
 ἐκτελέω: ἐκτελέσῃ 2.15.
 ἐκτός: 14.34.
 ἐκφαίνω: ἐξεφάνῃς 4.4.
 ἐλαύνω: ἐλαυνόμενον 1.23; ἐλ[αύνων 3.25.
 ἐλαφηβόλος: ἐλαφηβόλε 12.2, 15.23.
 ἔλαφος: ἐλάφου 13.6A-B.
 ἔλδωρ: κρήνην ἐέλδωρ 8.29.
 ἐλέγχω: ἐλέ(γ)ξω 13.26A-B.
 ἐλλοφόνος: ἐλλοφόνα 14.9.
 ἔμβρυον: ἔμβρυον 13.4A, 3B.
 ἐμός: ἐμαῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπαιδαῖς 1.22, 27; ἐμαῖς 2.14, 15, 8.10, 12.20, 37, 14.18, 31, 15.55; ἐμαῖς ἱεραῖσιν ἐπωδαῖς 2.17; ἐμαῖς ἐπαιδαῖς 14.28; ἐμῶν 10.26, 27, 15.2; ἐμῆς 11.75; ἐμῇ 14.22; ἐμαῖσι 14.38.
 ἔμπεδος: ἔμπεδα 15.41.
 ἐμπνέω: ἐμπνευσον 7.6.
 ἐν: 1.29, 33, 2.12, 14, 15, 18A, 21B, 3.1, 7, 4.1, 7.4, 34, 10.9, 20, 21, 23, 11.97, 13.10B, 14.19, 20, 35, 15.5, 18, 33, 51; ἐνὶ 2.11, 8.35, 12.19, 15.48; ἐν ᾗ 11.18, 19, 20, 21; νυκτὸς ἐν ὥρῃ 6.3; νυκτὸς ἐ[ν ὥ]ρῃ 8.18.
 ἐναντίος: ἐναντίως 13.26A-B.
 ἔνεκα: ἔνεκεν 10.12; τοῦνεκα 15.20.
 ἐνέπω: ἐννεπε 7.11, 30.
 ἐνεύχομαι: ἐνεύχομαί σοι 11.17, 24, 25.
 ἔνθα: 1.21, 2.8.
 ἐνθάδε: 6.6.

- ἐνιαύσιος: ἐνιαύσια ἔργα 9.3.
 ἐνιαυτός: ἐνιαυτόν 2.6.
 ἔντερον: ἔντερα 13.16A–B.
 ἐξαιτέω: ἐξαιτοῦ 8.20.
 ἐξαναβλύζω: ἐξαναβλύων 5.4.
 ἐξαναλύω: ἐξαναλύεις 2.4.
 ἐξεγείρω: ἐξεγείρουσαν 10.18;
 ἐξεγείρατε 10.22.
 ἔξειμι: ἔξεστι 11.15, 77.
 ἐξῆς: 12.29.
 ἔξοχος: ἔξοχ' 3.30.
 εὐός: εὐόν 7.22; εὐαῖς 8.4, 15.39; εὐοῖς
 15.37.
 ἐπακούω: ἱερῆς ἐπάκουσον ἀοιδῆς
 7.4; ἐπάκουσον 12.20, 34, 38,
 15.2, 44; ἐπακούσατέ 10.22.
 ἐπείγω: ἐπείγομαι 8.34.
 ἐπέρχομαι: ἐπέλθοι 14.17.
 ἐπέχω: ἐπέσχες 1.13.
 ἐπήκοος: ἐπήκοε 11.29.
 ἐπί: 2.25A, 7.5, 29, 8.27, 10.21,
 12.28, 14.14; ἐπ' 1.27, 2.17, 12.18,
 37, 14.18, 21, 22, 28, 31, 38, 15.55.
 ἐπίθυμα: ἐπιθύματα 3.27.
 ἐπιθύω: ἐπιθύει 13.1B.
 ἐπικαλέω: ἐπικαλοῦμαι 2.22B.
 ἐπικλώθω: ἐπικλώσει 11.7.
 ἐπιτομή: ἐπιτομή 14.11.
 ἐπίρροθος: ἐπίρροθος 6.1;
 [ἐπ]ίρροθε 8.16.
 ἐπισκεπάζω: ἐπισκεπάζεις 3.23.
 ἐπισκοπιάζω: ἐπισκοπιάζει[ς] 1.9.
 ἐπίσκοπος: νερτέρων ἐπίσκοπε
 11.23; ἐπίσκοπος 14.6; νερτέρων
 ἐπίσκοπος 11.73.
 ἐπιτάσσω: ἐπιτασσόμενα 10.28.
 ἔπος: ἔπεσιν 3.8.
 ἐποχέομαι: ἐποχούμενος 2.1.
 ἐπωδή: ἐμαῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπαιδαῖς 1.22,
 27; ἐμαῖς ἐπαιδαῖς 14.28; ἐμαῖς
 ἱεραῖσιν ἐπωδαῖς 2.17; ἱερῶν
 ἐπαιδῶν 15.2.
 ἐπωνυμία: ἐπωνυμίαις 12.34,
 15.44.
 ἐράσμιος: ἐράσμιον 13.27A.
 ἔργον: ἐνιαύσια ἔργα 9.3.
 Ἑρεβος: Ἑρεβος 15.49.
 ἐρέφω: ἔρεψα 8.27.
 ἐρημαῖος: ἐρημαίη 12.16.
 ἔρνος: ἔρνο{υ}ς 13.28A.
 ἐρπετόν: ἐρπετὰ 3.6.
 ἐρπυστήρ: ἐρπυστήρων 15.13.
 ἔρχομαι: ἐλθέ 1.1, 11.6, 15.55; ἐλθέ
 τάχος 7.5; ἐλθ' 12.37; ἐλθέ μοι
 15.1; ὕλας ἔλθοις 1.8; ἐς φάος
 ἐλθεῖν 1.28; εἰς φάος ἐλθεῖν
 2.18B; ἔλευσόμενον 2.13; ἔρχεο
 χαίρων 6.1; ἔρχε[ο θ]ᾶσσον 8.34.
 ἔρω: ἔρωτος 14.35.
 ἐρωτοτόκεια: ἐρωτοτόκεια 12.30.
 ἐσθίω: φαγεῖν 13.16A–B.
 ἐσθλός: ἐσθλά 6.7.
 ἐσχάρα: ἐσχάρα 11.93.
 ἔσω: εἴσω 1.35.
 ἐτάζω: ἐ]τάζω 8.14.
 ἐταῖρος: Φοῖβοιο ἐταίρη 8.32.
 εὐμένεια: εὐμενίη 15.2.
 εὐμενής: εὐμενής 1.37; εὐμενέως
 15.28.
 εὐνή: εὐνή 14.22.
 εὐπατόρεια/εὐπατέρεια:
 εὐπατόρεια 14.3.
 εὐρίσκω: εὐρε 9.1.
 εὐρύς: εὐρεῖαν 15.34; εὐρύ 15.49.
 εὐρύστοχος: εὐρύστοχε 11.39.
 εὐστοχος: εὐστοχε 11.32.
 εὐτε: εὐτ' 7.25.
 εὐχερής: εὐχερῶς 13.7B.
 εὐχή: εὐχαῖσιν 12.20.
 εὐχομαι: εὐχομένη 12.38.
 ἐφορεύω: ἐ[φορε]ύεις 3.24.
 ἐχθρός: ἐχθρῶ 11.97; ἐχθρόν
 13.1B.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- ἔχω: ἔχω 1.19, 11.87; ἔχοιτε 3.2; ἔ[χοιτε 3.7; ἔχων 6.6, 8; ἔχω[v] 8.14; ἔχοντι 8.10; ἔχειν 9.3, 13.17A; ἐχόμενον 10.8; ἔχεις 12.5, 15.17, 26, 51; ἔχουσα 12.19, 14.10, 34, 15.48; ἔχουσ' 14.19; ἔχοντες 14.14, 15.
- ἐῶς: ἐῶι 4.8.
- ζάθειος: ζαθεΐη 11.41.
- ζάθεος: ζαθέην 8.22.
- ζυγόν: ζυγά 7.24.
- ζωνοδράκοντις: ζωνοδράκοντι 15.52.
- ζῶον: ζῶων 9.1.
- ἦ: ἦ εἰ δὴ ποτέ 8.28; πρὶν ἦ 11.55.
- ἦ: 11.46; ἦ μὴν 11.87.
- ἡγεμονεύς: τὸν οὐρανοῦ ἡγεμονῆα 1.20.
- ἡγεμόνη/ἡγεμόνεια: ἡγεμόνη 14.4.
- ἡδέ: 8.29, 11.10, 12.28, 14.33; ἡδ' 15.8.
- ἦδη: 14.38; δεῦρ' μοι ἦδη 7.28.
- ἡδύς: ἡδὺν 10.24.
- ἡλιώτις: ἡλιωτίδος 11.22, 63.
- ἦκω: ἦκεις 11.96; ἦκοι 14.31.
- ἥλιος: ἡλίος 7.12, 8.20, 9.13, 15.5.
- ἦμαρ: ἡματος 7.20.
- ἡμέρα: ἡμέρᾱ 10.20.
- ἡμερος: ἀφρὸν ἡμερον 5.4; ἡμέρη 11.40;
- ἡμέτερος: ἡμετέρων 1.4; ἡμετέρης 7.9.
- ἡνίκα: ἡνίκ' 12.27.
- ἡριγένεια: ἡριγένεια 15.3.
- ἡρώϊς: ἡρώϊδες τε δυστυχεῖς 10.19.
- ἦρωες: ἦρωες ἀτυχεῖς 10.9, 19; ἡρώων 14.13.
- ἦσυχος: ἦσυχον 3.1; ἦσυχε 12.19, 15.48.
- ἡχώ: ἡχῶ 12.16.
- ἡώς: ἡοῦς 3.26, 9.13.
- θάλασσα: θάλασσα 9.10, 12.15.
- θαλίος (<θάλος): θαλία 11.41.
- θαλλός: θαλ[λὸν 8.10.
- θάλος: κόσμου θάλος 2.22A.
- θανατηγός: θανατηγέ 15.53.
- Θάσιος: Θασία 11.36.
- θαῦμα: μέγα θαῦμα 3.11.
- θαυμάζω: θαυμάσεις 11.54.
- θεά: θεά 12.9, 24, 34, 13.1A–B, 13A, 15.22, 31, 44; θεάν 13.27A.
- θεῖος: θεῖα 1.18; θεῖον πνεῦμα 1.18; θε(ῖ)ον 3.14; πνεύματι θε(ῖ)ῳ 4.3.
- θέλημα: θελημάτων 10.27.
- θέλησις: θέλησιν 10.27.
- θέμις: θέμις 13.10A–B.
- θεμιτός: θεμιτὸν 13.19B.
- θεοπρόπος: [θε]οπρόπε 8.17.
- θεός: (θε)οῦ 1.5; θεοῦ 1.11, 3.32; σφραγίδα θεοῦ 1.12; σφραγίδ[α] θε[οῦ 3.29; κρητήρα θεοῦ 1.14; θεὸν αἰώνιον 1.15; θεὸν] ἀθάνατον 3.10; θεὸν 13.27B; θεοῖσι 3.11; θεὸς 3.16; παντοκράτωρ θεός 3.21; εἰς θεὸς ἀθάνατος 9.5; θεοὶ κ[αὶ] δαίμονες 3.30; θεῶν θεέ 4.2; θεῶν ἀρχηγέτη 11.86; θεῶν 11.97; Τύχη θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων 13.22A–B; θεῶν γενέτειρα 15.32.
- θεσμός: θεσμοὺς 8.35.
- θεσπέσιος: θεσπ[εσί]ους 8.35.
- θεσπίζω: θεσπίζων 6.3; θέσπιζε 8.6; θεσπίζω[v] 8.18.
- θέσπισμα: θε[σ]πίσματ' ἀληθῆ 6.8.
- θεωρέω: θεωροῦσα 11.88; θεωρουμένη 11.88.
- Θηβαῖος: Θηβαία 11.43.
- θηροκτόνος: θηροκτόνε 12.18.
- θνήσκω: θανον 14.13.
- θνητός: θνητοὶ 12.13.
- θοός: θοή 11.25.
- θρινακία: see τρινακρία.
- θρίξ: θρίξ 11.62.

INDEXES

- θυμάνδρειος: θυμάνδρεια 11.26.
 θυμίασμα: θυμίασμα 13.1A–B.
 θυμός: κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ
 θυμόν 1.19; θυμόν 14.14.
 θύρα: θύραις 14.27; θύραισι
 14.31, 38.
 θυσία: θυσίαις 12.37, 15.55.
 θύω: (θύω) 12.1; θύω 15.45; θύει
 13.1A.
 ἴβις: ἴβεως 13.10A–B.
 Ἰδαῖος: Ἰδαῖα 11.34.
 ἰδέ: 12.15.
 ἴδιος: ἴδια 1.36.
 ἰέραξ: ἰέρακα 13.12A; ἰέρακος
 13.18A–B.
 ἰερός: ἰερῶν στομάτων 1.4; ἰερῶν
 λόγων 11.4; ἰερῶν ἐπαιοιδῶν
 15.2; ἐμαῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπαιοιδαῖς 1.22,
 27; ἐμαῖς ἱεραῖσιν ἐπωδαῖς 2.17;
 ἱερῆς κορυφῆς 6.7; ἱερῆς
 ἐπάκουσον αἰοιδῆς 7.4; ἱερὸν 7.1,
 8.1, 31, 11.1, 12.11; ἱεροῖσι 8.9;
 ἱερά 11.2.
 ἰκέτης: ἰκέτη 7.11.
 ἰκνέομαι: ἰκνοῦμαι 3.22.
 ἴλαος: ἴλαος ἔλθοις 1.8; ἴλαος
 ἔ[σσο 3.9; ἴλα{υ}ος ἔ(σ)ο 3.16.
 ἴλημι: ἴλαθί μοι 1.32, 2.22A, 25B,
 5.10, 15.28.
 ἰμάσθλη: ἰμάσθλης 7.26.
 ἴνα: 1.36; ἴν' 2.15, 8.14.
 ἰνδάλιμος: ἰνδαλίμη 11.32.
 ἰοβόλος: ἰοβόλοις 15.14.
 ἰοχέαιρα: ἰοχέαιρα 11.44, 12.1,
 14.2, 15.45; ἰοχέαιραν 15.21.
 ἰππεύω: ἰππεύουσα 15.5.
 ἵπποπρόσωπος: ἵπποπρόσωπε
 12.24.
 ἵππος: ἵππος 11.58.
 ἱπόχθων: ἱππόχθων 14.30.
 ἰσάριθμος: ἰσάριθμον 1.30, 2.20A,
 23B.
 ἰσοπάρθενος: ἰσο{υ}πάρθενος
 11.10.
 ἴσος: ἴσον 15.5.
 ἴστημι: στήσατε 3.5; σταθεῖς 7.6;
 στήθι 7.10; στάντες 14.16.
 ἴφι: ἴφι ἀνάσσεις 8.22.
 ἰχώρ: ἰχώρα 13.3A–B.
 ἰωγή: ἰωγή 14.24.
 ἰωή: ἰωήν 12.8.
 καθάρος: καθαρὸν 2.25A;
 καθαρῶν στομάτων 5.4.
 κάθαρσις: μηνιαῖα καθάρσεις
 13.20A; μηνιαῖα καθάρσει
 13.20B.
 καίω: ἔκηα 8.28.
 κακός: κακόν 11.99.
 καλέω: σὲ καλῶ 1.7, 7.33, 14.9, 12;
 καλῶ σε 13.27A, 14.28; καλέσω
 11.4; καλέοντι 15.28.
 καλλιγένεια: καλλιγένεια 15.31.
 καλός: καλῶν 11.13; καλὰ 11.100.
 κάμηλος: καμήλου 11.62.
 κάμνω: καμόντων 10.18.
 κάνθαρος: κάν[θαρε 3.10;
 κἀν[θαρε 3.11; κάνθαρε 5.5;
 κάνθαρον 13.18A–B.
 καπετόκτυπος: καπετόκτυπε 15.54.
 καρδία: καρδίαν 10.11, 13.3A, 4B.
 καρδιόδαιτος: καρδιόδ{υ}αιτε
 15.53.
 καρκίνος: καρκίνιοι 13.7A–B.
 καρπίζω: καρπίσηθε 10.8;
 καρπίσασθε 10.11.
 καρπός: καρπῶν γενέτης 9.2.
 κατά: 12.16, 15.12, 15.15; κατ[ὰ
 3.32; κ[ατ]ὰ 8.28; κατ' 13.19A–B;
 κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν
 1.19.
 κατάγω: κατάγουσα 7.24.
 κατάδυσις: κατά[δυς]ιν 8.20.
 κατακαμψυψαύχενος:
 κατα(καμ)ψυψαύχενε 14.4.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- κατάκειμαι: κατάκειται 14.19.
καταλαμβάνω: καταλάβω 11.8;
καταλάβη 11.81.
καταλέγω: καταλέξας 1.25.
καταλείψανον: καταλείψανα 10.6.
καταπάλλομαι: καταπάλλεται
7.25.
κατάτροπος: κατάτροπον 13.26A–B.
κατερύκω: κατερύκετε 3.1.
κατέχω: κατέχοντα 1.6, 14, 3.15;
κατέχω 2.14; κατέχεις 15.39.
κατοικέω: κατοικείς 7.37.
κάτοπτρον: κάτοπτρον 11.54.
κατωμάδιος: κατωμαδίοις 15.14.
κελάδω: κελάδοντα(ς) 4.7;
κελαδοῦντες 12.15.
κελαινός: κελαιναῖς 15.10.
κέλευθος: κελεύθους 9.1.
κελεύω: ἐκέλευσεν 9.3.
κέλομαι: (κ)έλομαι 14.24.
κέρας: κέρας 13.6B.
κερατῶπις: κερατῶπι 12.23.
κεραύνοπλος: κεραύνοπλο{υ}ς
11.21.
κερόεις: κερόεσσα 15.32.
κευθμών: κευθμῶνα 2.11.
κεφαλή: κεφαλὴν 1.11, 8.3;
κεφαλῆς 14.16.
κηρύκειον: κηρύκιον 11.91.
Κίλλα: Κίλλαν 8.22.
κινέω: κινήθησεται 11.71.
κισσοχαίτης: κισσοχαίτα 7.29.
κλαγγή: κλαγγῆς 12.10.
κλάδος: κλάδον 6.6; κλάδοις 8.2.
κλειδοῦχος: κλειδοῦχε 10.4.
κλειθρον: κλειθρον 11.20, 93;
κλειθρα 11.50.
κλείς: κλείς 11.49, 91.
κλείω: κλείει 11.19.
κλήζω: 1.30, 2.20A, 23B, 3.17, 20;
κλήζω σε 1.20, 2.7; κ[λήζω 3.10;
σὲ κλήζω 3.14; κλήζουσι 15.20.
κλυτόπωλος: κλυτόπωλε 7.14.
κλύω: κλύθι, μάκαρ 1.20, 2.7, 7.8;
κλύθι μευ 8.21; κλύε 7.8; κλύθι
14.5.
κλωθαίη: κλωθαίη 11.38.
κνήμη: κνήμαισιν 15.18.
κοινός: κοινά 13.27B; κοι(νόν)
14.30.
κοίρανος: κοίρανε (παντός) 4.2;
κοίρανε κόσμου 7.13; κοίρανε
13.21A–B.
κολλητός: κολλητόν 14.17.
Κολοφών: Κολοφῶνι 7.4.
κόλπος: κόλποις 14.19.
κομάω: κομώωσαν 8.3.
κόνδυλος: κονδύλους 11.9.
κόπρος: κόπρον 13.9A–B.
κόραλλος: κόραλλος 11.61.
κορυφή: κορυφῆς 6.7.
κόσκινον: κόσκινόν 11.60.
κοσμικός: κοσμικά 12.10, 27.
κόσμος: οὐράνιον κόσμον 1.6, 3.15;
κόσμον 2.6, 3.24, 25, 4.3, 12.16,
15.29; πάτερ κό[σ]μοιο 1.10;
ἄναξ κόσμοιο 3.22; δέσποτα
κόσμου 2.10, 23A; κόσμου θάλος
2.22A; κόσμου πάτερ 2.25B;
κόσμου [γενέτω]ρ 3.9; κοίρανε
κόσμου 7.13; κόσμου 12.26;
κόσμω 1.13; κόσμ[ος] 3.8;
κόσμος 3.24, 11.103.
κουφίζω: κουφίσει 11.70.
κραδαίνω: κραδαίνει 11.71.
κραίνω: κρήνην ἐέλδωρ 8.29.
κραιπνός: κραιπνὴ 13.21A.
κραταιόφρων: κραταιόφρων 7.8.
κρατερός: κρατερῆς 14.35.
κρατέω: κρατῶ 11.49, 84.
κρατήρ: κρητήρα θεοῦ 1.14.
κράτιστος: κράτιστον 1.16.
κρατύνω: πάντα κρατύνεις 9.6.
κρόμμυον: κρόμμυον 13.8A–B.

- κρόταφος: κροτάφοισιν 15.37.
 κρύπτω: ἔκρυψα 11.49; κρύψει 11.69.
 κτείνω: κτανεῖν 13.15A–B.
 κτίζω: ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας 4.5.
 κτίστης: παντὸς κτίσ{κ}τα 4.2.
 κυαμών: κυαμῶνος 5.3.
 κυάνεος: κυάνεος 11.92; κυανέα 15.52.
 κυδιάνειρα: κυδιάνειρα 15.31.
 κύδιμος: κύδιμε 7.3; μολπής κύδιμ' ἀνάκτωρ 7.7; κυδίμη 11.38.
 κύκλος: κύκλον 5.5.
 κύμβαλον: κυμβάλων 11.52.
 κύνειος: κύνειον 13.3B.
 κυνοκεφάλειος: κυνοκεφάλ(ε)ιον 13.9B.
 κυνοκέφαλος: κυνοκεφάλαιο 13.9A; κυνοκέφαλος 13.20A–B.
 κυνολύγατε: κυνολύγατε 12.24.
 κυνώ: κυνό 11.37.
 κυοφορέω: κυοφορ(εῖ) 11.102.
 κύριος: κύριε 1.2, 9.7, 11; κυρία 10.15, 29; νύκτα κυρίαν 11.17.
 κύων: κύων μέλαινα 10.30; κύων 11.10, 19, 92; κυνὸς 13.4A; κύνες 15.19.
 κωμάζω: κωμάζουσα 15.7.
 λαγχάνω : ἔλαχες 14.11.
 λαῖλαψ: λαῖλ[α]ψ 8.23.
 λαλέω: λαλούντων 1.4.
 λαμβάνω: εἰλημμένη 11.2.
 λαμπάδιος: λαμπαδία 12.31.
 λαμπάς: λαμπάς 11.58; λαμπάσι 15.10.
 λάμπω: λάμπων 3.22.
 λανθάνω: ληθομένη 14.32.
 λέγω: λέγε 6.4, 7.12, 8.19; λέγω 11.82, 99; ἔρῳ 11.90; ἔλεξε 13.14A; ἔλεξεν 13.11B; λέγει 13.16B, 13.27B.
 λέιπω: λίπε 1.3; λείπεται 11.103.
 λείψανον: λείψανον 2.14.
 λειψίφωτος: λειψίφωτες 10.10.
 λεπτός: λεπτά 13.5A.
 λευκός: λευκὸν 5.2.
 λέων: ἀκμαῖε δὲ λέων 5.1; λέων 11.59; λεόντων 15.18.
 Λήθη: Λήθης 12.11.
 Λητοΐδης: Λητοΐδη 6.2; [Λ]ητοΐδη 8.17.
 Λητῶς: Λατῶε 8.24.
 λιγύς: λιγ{γ}εῖα 11.41.
 λιμενίτις: λιμενίτι 12.35; λιμ(ε)νίτι 15.46.
 λίνον: λίνα 11.7.
 λιπαροπλόκαμος: λιπαροπλόκαμε 11.41.
 λίσσομαι: λίτομαί σε 2.10, 12.38; λίτομαι 5.7.
 λόγος: ἱερῶν λόγων 11.4; λόγων 11.77; λόγῳ 13.28B.
 λοφαίη: λοφαίη 11.26.
 λοχιάς: λοχιάς 11.42.
 Λυδός: Λυδή 14.3.
 λύκαινα: λύκαινα 11.59, 12.24.
 λυκά: λυκά 11.34.
 λῦμα: λύματα 13.5A.
 λύπη: λύπην 10.25.
 λυσσάω: λυσσῆς 11.10.
 λύω: λύθητι 11.6.
 μαγεία: μαγείης 11.75.
 μάγος: μάγων 11.46.
 μαίνομαι: μαινομένη 14.31.
 μάκαρ: κλυθι, μάκαρ 1.20, 2.7, 7.8; μάκαρ 2.10; μάκαιρα 11.8, 12.17.
 μάντευμα: μάντευμ[α] 8.11.
 μαντεύομαι: μαντεύο 6.3, 8.18.
 μαντοσύνη: μαντοσύναισιν 6.1; μαντοσύνης 7.1, 8.1; μαντοσύνην 7.10; [μ]αντοσύναισιν 8.16; μαντο[σ]ύνης 8.31.
 μεγαλόστονος: μεγα[λ]όστονος 8.7.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- μέγας: Ζηγὸς μεγάλοιο 1.5;
 μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο 15.38;
 μεγίστην 1.34; μέγαν 2.3, 7.34;
 μέγα θα[ῦμα 3.11; μέγιστε 3.17;
 μέγι[στος 3.21; μ]εγάλου 3.32;
 μεγάλα 11.100; μέγιστον 13.13A;
 μεγίστη 14.6.
 μεδέων: πυρὸς μεδέων 7.31;
 μεδέουσα 14.1.
 μέδω: μεδέεις 15.27, 43.
 μεθέπω: μεθέπεις 12.6.
 μείγνυμι: ἔμιξεν 10.7.
 μειλίχιος: μειλίχιον 1.26; μειλίχιος
 2.16.
 μελανεῖμων: μελανεῖμων 12.25.
 μέλας: κύων μέλαινα 10.30; μέλαν
 φῶς 11.55; μελαίνης 11.66.
 μελετάω: μελετῶν 8.19.
 μελίλων: μελίλωντον 5.3.
 μέν: μὲν . . . δ' 14.11, 15.21.
 μένω: μέναιτέ 3.4; μένοιεν 15.41.
 μέριμνα: μέριμναν 10.25;
 μερίμναις 14.18.
 μέσατος: μεσάταισι 2.12.
 μεσημβριάω: μεσημβριώνωντα
 7.21.
 μέσος: μέσον 3.25.
 μετά: 8.10; μετ' 13.4B.
 μεταζήτησις: μεταζήτησιν 10.26.
 μετόπισθε: 7.22.
 μέτρον: μέτρον 11.12.
 μέτωπον: μετώποις 15.11.
 μέχρι: μέχρις 1.35.
 μή: 1.36, 7.9, 11.11, 16, 56, 57, 78,
 80, 13.10A–B; ἂν μή 11.75; εἰ μή
 11.85.
 μηδέ: 1.27, 2.17; μηδ' 1.26, 2.16.
 μηδέποτε: 14.17.
 μήν: ἦ μὴν 11.87.
 μήνη/Μήνη: μή(ν)ης 9.13;
 Μήνη{ν} 11.23; Μήνη 11.36,
 12.21; Μήνην 13.27A, 15.20.
 μηνιαῖος: μηνιαῖα καθάρσεις
 13.20A; μηνιαῖα καθάρσει
 13.20B.
 μηνίω: μηνίσης 1.27, 2.17.
 μηνύω: μηνυσάτω 2.19B.
 μηρία: μηρί' 8.28.
 Μινώιος: Μινώα 11.42.
 μίτος: μίτον 11.74.
 μίτρα: μίτρην 13.16A–B.
 μίτριος: μιτρήν 11.33.
 μοῖρα: μοῖράν 11.77; μοῖρα 11.81.
 μολπή: ἀναξ μολπῆς ... μολπῆς
 κύδιμ' ἀνάκτωρ 7.7; μολπὴν
 7.30.
 μόνος: μοῦνος 3.24; μόνον 13.8A,
 14.34; μοῦνον 13.8B; μόνη
 τύραννε 13.21A–B; μούνη 15.35.
 μορφή: μορφᾶς 9.1, 15.18;
 μορφαῖσι 12.7, 15.6.
 μορφόλυκος: μορφόλυκον 15.19.
 μούσαρχος: μουσιάρχα 8.33.
 μύγαλος: μύγαλον 13.13A;
 μυγάλου 13.9B.
 μύκημα: μύκημα 15.12.
 μύρινος (<μύρον): μυρίναις
 10.21.
 μυρσίνη: μυρσίνην 13.6A–B.
 μύσαγμα: μύσαγμα 13.2A–B.
 μυσταγωγός: μυσταγωγός
 11.13.
 μυστήριον: μυστήριον 13.13A.
 μυστικός: σύμβολα μυστικά 5.7.
 ναῖω: ναίων 7.4.
 νᾶμα: νάματα 3.4.
 νάπη: νάπαι 12.14.
 νασμός: ν[ασμῶν 3.4.
 Νειλωίτις: Νειλωίτιδος 11.53.
 νεκρός: νεκρᾶς 13.3A, 13.6A;
 νεκροῦ 13.4A.
 νέκυς: νεκύων 2.11.
 νέμω: νέμονται 1.21, 2.8; νέμεις
 9.6.

INDEXES

- νεοπενθής: νεοπενθής 11.34.
 νέος: νεᾶς 13.10A–B; νέου 13.4B;
 νέα 15.3.
 νερτέριος: νερτέριαί τε πύλαι
 12.11; νερτερία 12.36,
 15.47.
 νέρτερος: νερτέρων ἐπίσκοπε
 11.23; νερτέρων ἐπίσκοπος
 11.73.
 νεύω: νεύσον ἐμοί 5.7; νεύσον
 11.8; ἐνευσας 11.86.
 νηδύς: νηδὺν 15.13.
 νήθουσα: νήθουσα 11.64.
 νῆμα: νήματα Μοιράων 2.19A;
 νήματα Μοιρῶν 15.7.
 νομαῖος: νομαῖε 11.30.
 νόμος: νόμοισι 2.5.
 νόος: νοῦν 11.72.
 νότος: νότον 11.69.
 νυκταιροδύτεια:
 νυκταιροδύτεια 12.21.
 νυκετρόφοιτος: νυκτε[ρόφ]οιτε
 8.25.
 νυκτιβόη: νυκτιβόη 15.16.
 νυκτοφάνεια: νυκτοφάνεια 12.2,
 15.23.
 νῦν: 2.20B, 3.5, 22, 7.9, 12.8, 25; καὶ
 δὴ νῦν 2.10; καὶ νῦν 6.8.
 νύξ/Νύξ: νυκτὸς 1.23, 2.13, 3.26,
 9.13, 15.3, 29; νυκτὸς ἐν ᾧρη 6.3;
 νυκτὸς ἐ[ν ᾧ]ρη 8.18; Νύξ 7.25,
 15.49; νυκτί 8.35, 10.23; νύκτα
 11.17, 51.
 νύσσα: 11.28.
 νύχιος: νυχία 10.3, 12.18, 25,
 15.47.
 νῶτον: νῶτα 15.15.
 ξενίζω: ξε[ινί]ζεται 3.8.
 ξένος: ξείνη 11.24.
 ξιφήρης: ξιφήρεις 11.9.
 ξύλον: ξύλοις 13.11B.
 ὄδε: τόδε 1.24, 2.14, 8.29, 12.37,
 15.55; ἦδε 8.30; τήνδε 11.17, 87;
 τόδ' 12.1, 15.45.
 ὁδός: ὁδοῦς 14.11.
 οἶκος: οἶκον 7.22.
 οἰκουμένη: ὁ[λ]ην οἰκουμένην
 7.37; οἰκουμένην 11.70.
 οἶος: οἶον 11.99.
 οἰστροπλάνεια: οἰστροπλάνεια
 15.54.
 οἰωνός: οἰωνοὶ 3.5.
 ὀλέτις: ὀλέτις 15.50.
 ὀλκίτις: ὀλκίτι 11.26.
 ὀλοός: οὐλοή 11.35.
 ὄλος: ὁ[λ]ην οἰκουμένην 7.37; ὄλης
 11.68; ὄλη 13.20B.
 Ὀλυμπος: Ὀλύμπου 1.7; Ὀλύμ[που]
 3.29; Ὀλυμπος 1.11; Ὀλύμπω
 15.33.
 ὀμιλέω: ὀμιλῶν 7.5.
 ὄμμα: ὄμμα τέλ[ειον] 3.18; Διὸς
 γαίηοχον ὄμμα 7.14; ὄμμα 15.17;
 ὀμμάτων 11.55, 13.19A–B.
 ὁμοιος: ὁμοίως 8.30.
 ὁμοῦ: 13.28A.
 ὄνομα: ὀνόματα 1.18; ὀνόματα
 σεμνά 11.101; οὖνομα 1.30,
 2.20A, 22B, 23B; ὄνομα 6.4.
 ὄνυξ: ὄνυξ 11.62.
 ὄξηρός: >ὄξυροῦντα 13.5A.
 ὄξος: ὄξους 13.4B.
 ὄξυβόης: ὄξυβόη 11.35.
 ὄξύς: ὄξειαν 12.8.
 ὀπάζω: ὀπάζοις 5.10.
 ὀπλίζω: ὀπλίζουσα 15.10.
 ὀπότε: ὀπ(π)ότ' 3.31.
 ὀπως: 1.18, 10.8.
 ὄρασις: ὄρασις 1.12.
 ὀράω: οἶδα 11.12, 46, 100; ἰδοῦσα
 11.54.
 ὀργίζω: ὀργίσθητι 11.96.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ὀρείπλανος: ὀρίπλανε 12.35
 15.46.
 ὀρεοβαζάγρα: ὀρεοβαζάγρα
 14.29.
 ὀρθρος: ὀρθρον 7.20.
 ὀρκίζω: ὀρκίζω 1.11, 12, 13, 14, 15,
 16, 17, 18, 33, 34, 35; ὀρκίζω σε
 3.29; ὀρκίζω σε 3.32.
 ὀρνις: ὀρνιθες 3.2.
 ὀρνυμι: ὄρσε 13.19A.
 ὄρος: Παρνάσιον ὄρος 1.3; οὐρεα
 9.2, 8, 12.14.
 ὄς: ὄν 1.2, 11.103; ὄς 1.9, 3.23, 7.37,
 8.21; ἦν 1.13, 11.54, 12.13, 26,
 13.26A–B, 15.30; ἄ 1.19, 13.10A;
 ἦ 2.19B; ἐν ἦ 11.18, 19, 20, 21; ὄν
 2.20B, 9.7; ἦς 7.2; ᾧ 7.36; οἷ 10.9;
 ὄ 11.56, 78, 82, 85, 13.10B; οἷς
 11.101; ἦ 12.5, 14.6, 15.6, 26; ἄ
 13.27B.
 ὄσος: ὄσσα 1.25; ὄσα 2.15, 13.27B.
 ὄσπερ: ὅπερ 1.11, 12; οὗπερ 1.24,
 2.14; ἄπερ 2.4.
 ὅστε: χᾶτ' 14.11.
 ὅταν: 13.20A.
 ὅτι: 2.22B, 5.6, 7, 11.12, 100; ὅτ[ι] 3.32.
 οὐ: 11.19, 77, 85, 13.19B; οὐκ 11.15;
 οὐχ 11.52.
 οὖν: 10.13.
 οὐράνιος: οὐράνιον κόσμον 1.6,
 3.15; οὐρανία 12.32, 35, 15.46.
 οὐρανόθεν: 7.5, 25.
 οὐρανός: τὸν οὐρανοῦ ἡγεμονῆα
 1.20, 2.7; οὐρανῷ 7.34; οὐρανός
 9.10, 11.101, 11.71.
 οὐρανοφοίτης: οὐρανοφοῖτα 7.15.
 οὐσία: οὐσίαν 13.4A.
 οὗτος: ταῦτα 1.18, 29, 2.18A, 21B,
 11.67, 13.14A; τοῦτον 1.22, 2.12,
 11.99; τοῦτο 6.4, 11.48, 56;
 [τοῦ]το 8.19; τοῦτ' 11.15, 13.11B;

τούτῳ 10.20; ταύτῃ 10.20, 21, 23;
 τούτου 13.15A–B.
 ὄφεωπλόκαμος: ὄφεωπλόκαμε
 15.52.
 ὄφρις: ὀφίων 15.11.
 ὄφρα: 15.41.
 ὄψ: ὅπα 12.17.
 πάγγαιος: πανγαίη 11.37.
 παιδέρως: παιδέρως 11.64.
 παῖς: παῖ 10.5; παιδός 13.4B.
 παιώνιος: παιωνία 11.27.
 παλαιγενής: παλαιγενές 7.16.
 παλαιός: παλαιόν 11.60.
 παλάμη: παλάμαισι 8.4;
 παλά[ι]μαισιν 15.39.
 παλαμναῖος: παλαμναῖος 15.15.
 πάλιν: 2.4, 4.6, 8.20, 13.26A–B.
 παλίνεδρος: παλίνεδρα 12.29.
 παμμήτωρ: παμμήτωρ 15.33.
 παμφαής: παμφαές 7.15.
 πανακήρατος: πανακήρατε 7.11.
 πανγεννήτειρα: πανγεννήτειρα
 12.30.
 πανδαμάτειρα: πανδαμάτειρα
 14.7.
 πανδώτειρα: πανδώτειρα 11.38.
 παντοῖος: παντοῖα 12.29.
 παντοκράτωρ: παντοκράτωρ θεός
 3.21; παντοκράτωρ 9.11.
 πάντοτε: πάντοτέ 11.5.
 παρά: παρὰ 14.27.
 παραδίδωμι: παρέδωκα 11.51.
 παρακούω: παρακούσης 7.9.
 παρεδρεύω: παρεδρεύει 2.20B.
 πάρειμι: παρέστω 14.21, 34, 38.
 παρθενική: παρθε[νι]κή 8.32.
 παρθένος: παρθένε 8.8, 10.3, 11.14,
 24, 44, 96, 14.8, 23; ταρταροῦχε
 παρθένε 11.82; βοός θριξ
 παρθένου 11.62; παρθένου
 13.3A–B.

INDEXES

Παρνάσιος: Παρνάσ{σ}ιον ὄρος 1.3.
 πᾶς: πᾶσα 1.10, 7.36, 9.10; αἰῶνά τε
 πάντων 1.15; πάντων 11.46,
 15.35; πάντων γεννήτωρ 9.5;
 δέσποτα πάντων 9.11; πᾶσι 1.34;
 πᾶσι 3.11; πᾶσιν 9.6; παντός
 1.37, 8.14; παντός κτίσ{κ}τα 4.2;
 κοίρανε <παντός> 4.2; πάντα
 2.15, 3.5, 11.3, 12.14, 28, 15.36,
 41; πάν(τ)α 4.3; ὁ τὰ πάντα
 κτίσσας 4.5; πάντα κρατύνεις
 9.6; πάντα τὰ φύντα 9.9;
 κοσμικά πάντα 12.10, 27; πάντ'
 15.36; πάντες 3.1, 29, 12.13;
 πάντας 7.19; πᾶν 14.33.
 πατήρ: πάτερ κό[σ]μοιο 1.10;
 κόσμου πάτερ 2.25B; πατήρ
 11.47.
 παύω: παύεσθε 3.3.
 πέδιλον: πέδιλοις 8.9.
 πεδίον: πεδίους 9.8.
 πελάγιος: πελαγίη 11.31; πελαγίου
 13.18A–B.
 πελαγοδρόμος: πελαγοδρόμον
 13.12A.
 πέλαγος: πέλαγος 3.31.
 πέλω: πέλει 9.12.
 πέμπω: πέμψωσί 1.18; πέμψον
 1.22, 2.12, 10.17; πέμψον 8.11;
 πέμπων 2.25A; πέμπω 10.2;
 πέμπεις 12.8.
 περί: 1.2, 8.14.
 περιδινοπλανήτης:
 περιδινοπλανῆται 4.8.
 περιστροφή: περιστροφῇ 4.1.
 Περσία: Περσία 11.30, 14.2.
 πέταλον: πετάλων 7.2.
 πετηνός: πετηνὸν 11.76.
 πέτρα: πέτρας 13.28B.
 πηγῇ: πηγῶν ποταμῶν 9.8.
 μικρός: μικροῖς 10.7; μικραῖς
 13.25A–B.

πίνω: πίνει 11.102; πиеίν 13.15A;
 π{ε}ιείν 13.15B; <πειν> 13.18A–B.
 πίτυρον: πίτυρα 13.5A.
 πίων: πίονα 8.28.
 πλάσσω: ἔπλασε(ν) 9.1.
 πλοῦτος: πλοῦτον 1.14.
 πνεῦμα: θεῖον πνεῦμα 1.19; ἅγιον
 πνεύματος 4.1; πνεύματος 11.67;
 πνεύματι θε(ί)ῳ 4.3; πνεύματα
 9.9.
 ποδαρκής: >ποδάρκη 11.28.
 πόθεν: 2.19B.
 ποιέω: ποιήση 10.28; ποιήσεις
 11.11, 57, 80; ποι(ή)σεις 11.16;
 ποιῆσαι 11.56; ποιήσον 11.82,
 15.55.
 ποικίλος: ποικίλης 13.2A–B.
 πολλάκις: 6.7.
 πόλος: πόλον 2.3, 7.21, 11.83.
 πολύκλειτος: πολυκλείτη 11.27.
 πολύμορφος: πολύμορφε 8.26,
 14.9, 15.9.
 πολύπτυχος: πολυπτύχου 8.5.
 πολυχώρητος: πολυχώρητον 15.29.
 πολυώδυνος: πολυώδυνη 12.20.
 πολυώνυμος: πολυώνυμη 14.23, 36,
 15.20, 31.
 πονέω: πονοῦντα 10.11.
 πόντος: πόντου 12.28.
 πορφύρεος: πορφυρέη 11.28.
 ποταμός: ποταμῶν 3.4; πηγῶν
 ποταμῶν 9.8; ποταμοῦ(ς) 4.7;
 ποταμοὶ 12.15.
 ποτε: 7.2; εἴ ποτε δὴ 6.6; εἴ ποτ[έ]
 τ]οι 8.27; ἢ εἰ δὴ ποτέ τοι 8.28.
 πότνια: πότνια 14.7.
 πράγμα: πραγμάτων 11.13; πρᾶγμα
 12.37, 13.11B, 15.55.
 πρᾶξις: πρᾶξις 11.87.
 πρᾶος: πρηῖν 1.26; πρᾶῖς 2.16.
 πρέσβειρα: πρέσβειρα 11.31.
 πρέσβυς: Ἑρμῆς ὁ πρέσβυς 11.47.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

πρίν: 2.9, 11.8, 9, 10, 81; πρίν ἤ 11.55.
 πρό: 7.23.
 προγενής: προγενέστερος 1.32.
 πρόθυρον: προθύροισι 14.21.
 προλείπω: προλιποῦσα 14.21.
 πολυσσάω: πολυσσᾷ 11.21.
 προμηθικός: προμηθική 11.27.
 προπάτωρ: προπάτωρ 1.32, 2.22A, 25B, 5.10.
 πρόσ: 8.20, 30, 11.69, 13.27B;
 πρόσ(ς) 11.12.
 πρόσθεν: 14.6.
 πρόσταγμα: προστάγμασι 1.23, 2.13.
 πρυμνήσιος: πρυμνήσια 1.36.
 πρωτάγγελος: πρωτάγγελε 1.7.
 πρώτιστος: πρώτι[στ]ον 3.14.
 πρωτόγονος: πρωτογόνου 4.4.
 πρώτος: πρώτε 1.5; πρώτον: 1.33;
 πρώτος 4.4.
 πρωτοφανής: πρωτοφανής 5.6.
 πτερυγοειδής: πτερυγοειδῶς 6.5.
 πτηνός: πτηνοί 3.5; πτηνῶν 12.29.
 Πυθολέτης: Πυθολέτα 8.23.
 Πυθώ: Δελφίδα Πυθῶ 1.3.
 πυκάζω: πεπυκασμένη 15.13.
 πύλη: πύλας 14.5; Στυγός
 ἀδ[μήτιοι] πύλας 3.28;
 νερτέρειά τε πύλαι 12.11.
 πύματος: πύματ' 11.36.
 πῦρ: πῦρ 1.33, 4.6, 11.63; ἀκάματον
 πῦρ 2.2, 12.5, 15.26; ἀκοιμήτου
 πυρός 2.24A; φυσικαί πυρὸς
 ἀρχαί 5.1; σπορίμου πυρός 5.5;
 πυρὸς ταμία 7.13; πυρὸς μεδέων
 7.31; πυρὸς ἀτμῶ 9.14; πυρὸς
 13.11A; πυρί 10.18.
 πυρῆν: πυρῆνά 13.8A–B.
 πυρίβουλος: πυρίβουλε 14.28.
 πυριδρακοντόζωνος:
 πυριδρακοντόζωνε 10.5.

πυρίπνοος: πυρίπνου 12.32;
 πυρίπνοα 14.10.
 πυρισθενής: πυρισθενές 7.17.
 πυριτρεφής: πυριτρεφέων 7.24.
 πυρίφοιτος: πυρίφοιτε 14.25.
 πυρόεις: πυρόεις 3.13.
 πυρός: πυρῶν 13.5A.
 πυρώω: πυρουμένη 11.93.
 πυρφόρος: πυρφόρε 2.23A.
 πωλικός: πωλικὸν 7.26.
 πῶλος: πῶλων 7.24.
 πωτήεις: πωτήεις 7.18.
 ρεῖθρον: ποταμῶν τε ρέεθρα 9.8.
 ῥήγνυμι: ῥαγῆναι 13.28B.
 ῥηξιτύλη: ῥηξιτύλη 14.27.
 ῥηξίχθων: ῥηξίχθων 14.7, 29.
 ῥίπτω: ῥίπτουσι 11.74.
 ῥόδον: ῥόδα 13.8A; ῥόδον 13.8B.
 ῥοδόσφυρος: ῥοδόσφυρος 7.22.
 ῥοή: ῥοαί 3.4.
 ῥοίζος: ῥοίζον 7.26.
 ῥόμβος: ῥόμβον 11.52; ῥόμβος
 11.92.
 σάνδαλον: σάνδαλον 11.49, 90.
 σαρκοφάγος: σαρκοφάγε 15.54.
 σάρξ: σάρκας 13.16A–B.
 σαφηνής: σαφηνέσι 8.12.
 σεαυτοῦ: σεαυτοῦ 4.3; σεαυτήν
 11.22, 54; σα(υ)τήν 11.78.
 σείω: σείουσα 15.11.
 Σελήνη/Σελήνη: Σελήνη 4.7;
 Σελήνην 8.30; Σελήνη 12.3, 20,
 31, 13.21B, 15.1, 24.
 σεμνός: σεμνὸν 8.11; ὀνόματα
 σεμνά 11.101; σεμνή 14.8.
 σημάντρια: Ταρτάρου σημάντρια
 11.94.
 σημεῖον: σημεῖον 11.90.
 σθένος: σθένος 5.10.
 σιγάω: σιγᾶ 3.31.
 σιγή: σιγὴν 3.2, 7.
 σιδήρεος: σιδηροῦς 11.92.

- σκευός: σκευός 11.60.
 σκήνος: σκήνους 1.24, 2.14.
 σκηπτουχος: ἀναξ σκηπτουχος 7.3;
 Μουσάων σκηπτουχε 7.28.
 σκήπτρον: σκήπτρον 15.39;
 σκήπτρω 15.40.
 σκιρτάω: σκιρτώντες 3.3.
 σκόρδον: σκόρδον 13.9A–B.
 σκότιος: σκοτεῖη 11.29; σκοτία
 12.36, 15.47.
 σκότος: σκότους 11.2; σκότει
 11.51; σκότος 11.94.
 σκυλακάγεια: σκυλακάγεια 14.7.
 σκυλακώδης: σκυλακώδεα 15.17.
 σκύλαξ: σκυλάκεσσι 12.7.
 σορός: σοροῖς 10.21, 12.19.
 σός: σῆς 1.23, 2.13, 12.10; [σῆ]ς 6.7;
 σόν 1.30, 2.20A, 23B, 11.18, 69,
 83, 13.13A; σὴν 1.34, 13.16A–B,
 13.18B; σοῖσι 2.5; σοῖς 13.10A–B;
 σαῖς 2.19A, 4.9; σαῖσιν 12.34,
 15.44; σῶ 7.11, 15.40; σῆ 9.12; σὰ
 11.100; σῶν 13.19A–B.
 σπεύδω: σπεύσειας 6.8; σπεῦδε
 14.38.
 σπόριμος: σπορίμου πυρός 5.5.
 στέαρ: στέαρ 13.2A–B, 6A.
 στείχω: στείχει 7.23.
 στέλλω: στῆλλεται 3.31.
 στέμμα: στέμμα 11.91.
 στέναγμα: στενάγμασιν 10.7.
 στέφω: στεφθεῖς 8.2.
 στηλῖτις: στηλῖτι 11.35.
 στιγμή: στιγμής 11.12.
 στίζω: στίξον 13.25A.
 στοιχεῖον: στοιχεῖα 2.5, 9.12.
 στόμα: ἱερῶν στομάτων 1.4;
 καθαρῶν στομάτων 5.4;
 ἀμβροσίων στομάτων 7.6;
 στομάτων 15.12; στομάτεσσι
 3.1, 12.9; ἀμβροσίου στομάτιοι
 7.10, 30; στόμα 11.19.
 στρατηλάτις: στρατηλάτι 11.33.
 στρέφω: στρέφω 11.52.
 συγερός: συγεράν 10.25.
 συγέω: συγέουσα 14.33.
 συγνός: συγνήν 11.8.
 Στύξ: Στυγὸς ἀδ[μήτοι]οι πύλας
 3.28.
 σύ: καὶ σὲ 1.6, 3.15, 17; καὶ σὲ καλῶ
 1.7; σε 1.10, 11.8, 53, 56, 81,
 12.17, 13.11B, 14A, 15A–B, 15.20;
 (σε) 3.10; σ' 11.46, 87; (σ') 15.36;
 σὲ καλῶ 7.33, 14.9, 12; καλῶ σε
 13.27A, 14.28; κλήζω σε 1.20,
 2.7; σὲ κλήζω 3.13; λίτομαί σε
 2.10, 12.38; ὀρκίζω σε 3.29, 32;
 σε τρέμει 9.10; βλέπω σε 11.89;
 σὺ 1.27, 2.17, 3.21, 9.5, 6, 10.15,
 12.27, 28, 13.21A–B, 14.23, 15.33,
 35, 43, 49, 50, 51; (δεῦρο σὺ) 4.2;
 σοῦ 2.5; σου 2.22B, 3.17, 4.1,
 7.23, 11.9, 12, 13, 48, 49, 72, 74,
 84, 13.17A–B; σέο 15.36; σοί
 7.20, 21; εἴ ποτ[έ τ]οι 8.27; ἢ εἰ δὴ
 ποτέ τοι 8.28; σοι 11.5, 7, 52, 89,
 99, 12.1, 13.1A–B, 8B, 12A, 18A,
 26A–B, 15.17, 41, 45; ἐνεύχομαί
 σοι 11.17, 24, 25; σὴν 11.70.
 σῦκον: σύκων 13.9A.
 συμβάλλω: συμβαλεῖν 11.87.
 σύμβολον: σύμβολα μυστικά 5.7;
 σύμβολον 11.48, 60, 67;
 συμβόλων 11.79.
 σύν: 1.1, 9.8, 13.4B, 14.12.
 σύνευνος: συνεύνου 11.98.
 συνέχω: συνέχεσθε 10.10.
 συνήθεια: συνηθείης 14.32.
 συρίζω: συρίζοντες 14.14.
 συνίστωρ: συνίστωρ 11.14.
 Συριστί: 13.23A.
 συρρήγνυμι: συναρῆσεται 11.68.
 σύστασις: σύστασις 8.30.
 σφαγιάζω: σφαγιάζει 13.12A.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- σφάγνος: σφάγνον 13.8A–B.
 σφίγγω: σφιγγομένη 15.15.
 σφίγξ: σφιγγός 11.66.
 σφίγγεις: σφίγγει 11.84.
 σφραγίς: σφραγίδα θεοῦ 1.12;
 σφραγίδ[α θ]ε[οῦ] 3.29.
 σφυρόν: σφυρόν 15.19.
 σχῖνος: σχινόν 13.6A–B.
 σῶζω: σῶζοντα 3.18.
 σῶμα: σῶμα 11.65.
 σώτειρα: σώτειρα 11.37.
 σωτήριος: σωτηρίην 11.45.
 τάλαρος: ταλάρουσιν 12.5, 15.26.
 ταμίας: πυρὸς ταμία 7.13.
 ταρσός: ταρσοῖσιν 15.14.
 Τάρταρος: Ταρτάρου Κόρη 10.4;
 Ταρτάρου 11.20, 12.12;
 Ταρτάρου σημάντρια 11.94.
 ταρταροῦχος: ταρταροῦχε 11.1;
 ταρταροῦχε παρθένε 11.82;
 ταρταροῦχου 11.50, 91.
 τάσσω: ἔταξας 1.29, 2.18A;
 τεταγμένα 2.5.
 ταυρεόμορφος: ταυρεόμορφε
 12.23.
 ταυροκάρηνος: ταυροκάρηνε
 15.16.
 ταῦρος: ταύρων 8.29, 15.12;
 ταύροιςιν 15.4.
 ταυρῶπις: ταυρῶπι 15.16, 32.
 ταυρωπός: ταυρωπόν 15.17.
 τάφος: τάφοις 15.48.
 τάχος: ἔλθὲ τάχος 7.5; δεῦρο τάχος
 7.29; διὰ τάχους 10.13.
 ταχύς: θάπτον 7.11; ἔρχε[ο θ]ᾶσσον
 8.34; ταχύτατον 11.76; τάχιστα
 14.21, 31, 38.
 τε: 1.15, 21, 2.8, 3.4, 7.32, 8.2, 13, 22,
 9.8, 13, 10.19, 11.70, 12.6, 11, 13,
 14, 15, 35, 36, 38, 13.2A, 6A–B, 8A,
 9A–B, 10A–B, 11A, 16A, 18A, 28A,
 14.13, 27, 32, 15.27, 46, 47; τε 1.11;
 {τε} 7.6, 11.103, 12.13; (τε) 7.19;
 τ]ε 8.11; τ' 2.11, 7.32, 11.24, 79,
 15.34, 50.
 τεῖρω: τεῖρῃσθω 14.18.
 τέκνον: τέκνων 14.32.
 τέκος: Διὸς τέκος 12.1, 15.45.
 τέλειος: ὅμμα τέλ[ειον] 3.18.
 τελευτάω: τελευτᾷ 15.36.
 τελέω: τελέση 1.19; τετελε[σμ]ένον
 8.13; τέλεσσον 12.37.
 τέλος: τέλος 11.76, 15.35.
 τέμνω: τέμνουσαν 15.21.
 Τένεδος: [Τε]νέδοιό 8.22.
 τένων: τένοντα 7.26.
 τεράστιος: τεραστίους 11.95.
 τερψίμβροτος: τερψίμβροτε
 11.42.
 τετραμερής: τετραμερές 2.22B.
 τετραοδίτις: τετραοδίτι 12.33,
 15.22.
 τετραπρόσωπος: τετραπρόσωπε
 15.22; >τετραπροσωπεινή
 12.33.
 τετράτροπος: τετρά(τρο)πον 2.6.
 τετραώνυμος: τετραώνυμε 12.33,
 15.22.
 τεύχω: τεύξον 13.25B.
 τηλεσκόπος: τηλεσκοπε 7.13.
 τίθημι: τέθεικας 12.27; ἔθηκε
 13.10A–B; θεῖναι 13.17A–B.
 τιμωρία: τιμωρίας 13.25A–B.
 τινάσσω: τινάσσων 8.4.
 τις: τι 13.1A–B; τινες 14.13; τιν'
 14.19.
 τίς: τίς 2.19B, 9.1, 2, 3, 4.
 τλητός: τλητή 11.43.
 τοκεύς: τοκήων 14.32.
 τόπος: τόπω 10.9, 20.
 τορέω: τορουμένη 11.66.
 τρεῖς: τρισὶ 12.7.
 τρέμω: τρέμουσιν 9.7.
 τρέφω: τρέφουσι 2.6; τρέφω 9.4.

INDEXES

- τρέχω: δραμεῖν 11.76.
 τριαύχενος: τριαύχενε 12.4, 15.25.
 τρίβος: τρίβοισι 2.3.
 τρικάρηνος: τρικάρανε 10.3, 12.3, 21, 14.8, 25, 15.8, 24.
 τρίκτυπος: τρίκτυπε 12.3, 15.24.
 τρινακρία: θρινακία 12.4, 15.25.
 τριοδίτης: τριοδίτι 12.4, 14.10, 15.25.
 τρίοδος: τρίοδον 12.6; τριόδων 15.27.
 τριπρόσωπος: τριπρόσωπε 12.4, 15.1, 25; τριπρόσωπον 13.27A.
 τρίς: τρίς 11.6.
 τρισσός: Μοῖραι τρισσαὶ 7.32; τρισσοῖς 12.5, 9, 15.26; τρισσῶν δεκάδων 12.6, 15.27; τρισσῶν τρισσαῖς 15.6.
 τρίφθογγος: τρίφθογγε 12.3, 15.24.
 τρήχωρος: τρήχωρον 11.93.
 τριώνυμος: τριώνυμε 12.21, 15.24.
 τρομέω: τρομ[έ]ει 11.10; τρομέοντες 3.7; τρομέουσιν 15.30.
 τροφή: τροφάς 10.2; τροφῆς 10.6; τροφήν 13.18A–B.
 τροφός: τροφοῦ 11.22.
 τρυγών: τρυγόνος 11.61.
 τύπος: τύπων 10.26.
 τύραννος: τύραννε 8.24; μόνη τύραννε 13.21A–B.
 τύχη/Τύχη: Τύχη θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων 13.22A–B.
 ὕδωρ: ὕδατος 4.5; ὕδωρ 4.6, 5.2, 12.11; ὕδατι 9.14.
 ὑπέρ: 3.3, 14.16.
 ὑπηρεσία: ὑπηρεσίαν 2.20B.
 ὕπνος: ὕπνον 10.24, 14.16.
 ὑπό: 15.15; ὑπ' 1.23, 2.13, 3.5, 10.28, 14.35.
 ὑποθημοσύνη: ὑποθημοσύνησι 2.19A.
 ὑποσκεπάζω: ὑποσκεπάουσα 15.18.
 ὑποστόρνυμι: ὑπεστρωμένης 11.5.
 ὑποτάσσω: ὑπετάγη 7.36.
 ὑπουργός: ὑπουργ(γός) 11.14.
 ὕστερος: ὕστατον 11.18.
 ὑφαιρέω: ὑφαιρῶν 6.5.
 ὑψηλός: ὑψηλοῖο 8.5.
 ὑψικέλευθος: ὑψικέλευθα 7.15.
 ὑψιπέτηλος: δένδρεον ὑψιπέτηλον 5.2.
 ὑψιφαής: ὑψιφαῖς 9.10.
 ὑψόσσε: 9.2.
 φαέθω: φαέθουσα 12.31.
 φαεινός: φαεννώ 11.31; φαεινόν 12.12.
 φαεσίμβροτος: φαεσίμβροτε 2.23A, 15.3.
 φαεσφόρος: φαεσφόρε 12.23, 14.8.
 φαίνω: φανέν 1.33.
 φαλεροῦχος: φαλεροῦχε 7.17.
 φάος: ἐς φάος ἐλθεῖν 1.28, 2.18B; φάος 2.9; φῶς 11.1, 18, 69, 13.27A; μέλαν φῶς 11.55; φῶτα 11.12; φωτὸς 11.81.
 φάσγανον: φασγάνων 11.26.
 φάσμα: φάσματ' 14.10.
 φέγγος: φέγγος 2.25A.
 φεραυγής: φεραυγέες 7.20.
 φερέσβιος: φερέσβιε 7.28.
 φεύγω: φυγεῖν 11.15, 56, 77; πέφευγε 11.73.
 φημί: ἔφη 13.15A–B.
 φθέγγομαι: ἐφθέγγεο 6.7.
 φθείρω: φθειρόντα 1.35.
 φθίω: φθιμέν[ο]ις 3.7; φθιμένοις 10.2.
 φθορηγενής: φθορηγενές 15.53.
 φιλάγρυπνος: φιλαγρύπνοις 14.18.
 φιλαίματος: φιλαίματε 8.26.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- φιλήρεμος: φιλήρεμε 15.16.
 φιλονίκος: φιλονικον 6.6.
 φίλος: φίλη 15.1; φίλοι 15.19.
 φιλότης: φιλότητι 14.22.
 φλέγμα: φλέγμασι 12.7.
 φλόξ: φλογός 2.2, 12.5, 15.26;
 φλόγες 7.20; φλόξ 11.94;
 φλόγας 13.11A.
 φοβερός: φοβεράν 10.25; φοβερά 12.22; φοβερόν 15.11.
 φοβέω: φοβεῖσθε 3.6; φοβηθείς 11.72; φοβοῦσα 11.95.
 φόβος: φόβου 11.45.
 φοιβάω: φοιβή[σα]σα 8.12.
 φοιτάω: φοιτᾷς 15.33.
 φολίς: φολί[ε]ῖσιν 15.13; φολίσιν 15.51.
 φορέω: φορέεις 15.37; φορέειν 15.41.
 φράζω: φρα[ς]τάω μοι 1.24;
 φράζω 5.7.
 φρήν: κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν 1.19; φρεσὶ 2.15, 14.14, 35;
 φρεσὶν 14.20.
 φρικτός: φρικτῆς 11.5; φρικτόν 12.9.
 φρίσσω: φρίσσο[υσι] 3.30;
 φρίσσουσί 12.17; φρίσσουντι 15.30.
 φρονέω: φρονέοντα 1.26;
 φρονέοιτο 2.16.
 φρῶνος: >φρούνη 14.2.
 φυγάς: φυγὰς 7.25.
 φυλακή: φυλακὰ 14.24.
 φυλάσσω: φύλαξον 1.28, 2.18B.
 φύλλον: φύλλα 13.11A.
 φυσικός: φυσικαὶ πυρὸς ἀρχαὶ 5.1.
 φύσις: φύσις 1.10, 7.36, 11.66,
 12.26; φύσιν αὐτοφυῆ 1.16;
 φύσιν ἀξέοντα καὶ ἐκ φύσεως
 φύσιν 3.19; φύσιν 13.17A–B.
 φυτόν: φυτόν Ἀπόλλωνος 7.1,
 8.31; φυτόν Ἀπόλλω[νο]ς 8.1.
 φύω: πέφυκας 9.5; πάντα τὰ φύντα 9.9; φύεθ' 9.12; ἔφυς 15.50.
 φωλεός: φωλ(ε)ιοῖσι 3.6.
 φωνή: φ[ωνήν] 3.1; φωνῆς 7.9;
 φωνήν 15.17.
 φωτίζω: φωτίζεται 11.101.
 φωτοπλήξ: φωτοπλήξ 11.1.
 χαιρετισμός: χαιρ(ε)τισμός) 7.12.
 χαίρω: κεχαρημένος 1.8; χαίρ[ω]ν 3.16; χαῖρε 5.1, 2, 7.13, 31, 11.1, 2,
 12.34, 15.44; ἔρχομαι χαίρων 6.1.
 χαίτη: χαίτην 15.11.
 χαλεπός: χαλεπὰς 14.11.
 χάλκεος: χάλκεον 11.90.
 χαμαίλυκον: χαμαίλυκον 11.64.
 χάος/Χάος: χάεός 1.21, 2.8; χάος 12.12; Χάος 15.49.
 χαρίεις: χαριέντ' 8.27.
 χάρις: χάριν 11.53.
 χαροπός: χαροπή 11.35; χαροποῖς 15.4.
 χάσκω: κέχνηε 11.19.
 χάσμα: χάσμα 12.12.
 χεῖρ: χέρα δεξιτερήν 1.13; χερσὶν 2.14; [χε]ρσὶν 8.10; χέρας 15.10.
 χηλή: χηλὰς 13.7A–B.
 χθόνιος: χθονία 12.25.
 χθών: χθονὸς 12.28.
 χορεύω: χορεύεις 15.6.
 χρήζω: χρήζουσα 11.23.
 χρηματίζω: χρημάτισόν μοι 1.2.
 χρόνος: χρόνον 2.20B.
 χρυσεόκυκλος: χρυσεόκυκλε 2.24A.
 χρύσεος: χρυσοῦ 5.3; χρύσειον 15.39.
 Χρύση: Χρύσην 8.21.
 χρυσήνιος: χρυσήνιε 7.18.
 χρυσοκέλευθος: χρυσοκέλευθα 7.18.
 χρυσοκόμης: Ἥλιε χρυσοκόμα 2.2;
 χ[ρ]υσοκόμην 3.10.

χρυσομίτρης: χρυσομίτρη
7.17.
χρυσοστεφής: χρυσοστεφῆ
11.30.
χρυσοφαής: χρυσοφαῖ 2.23A,
8.23.
χρυσῶπις: χρυσῶπι 11.42.
χωρίζω: χωρίζεται 11.18.
χώρος: χώρφ 2.11.
ψυχή: ψυχὰς 9.6, 10.18; ψυχῇ
14.22.
ψωμός: ψωμός 11.61.
ᾠδίνω: ᾠδίνουσι 7.20.
ᾠθέω: ᾠσεν 13.19B.
ᾠκεανός/Ωκεανός: Ωκεανῶ
7.24.
ὥν: ὥν 13.10A–B.
ᾠρα: ᾠραις 2.12; νυκτὸς ἐν ᾠρῃ 6.3;
νυκτὸς ἐ[ν ᾠ]ρῃ 8.18; ᾠρα
10.21.
ὥς: ὥς 11.46.
ᾠς: 8.13.

Personal names of deities and divine entities

Ἀβρασάξ: 1.8, 3.16.
Ἀδωναί: Ἀ]δωναί 1.9; Ἀδωνα[ί
3.23.
Αἰὼν/αἰών: αἰῶνά τε πάντων 1.15;
Αἰὼν Αἰ(ῶ)να τρέφων Αἰῶσιν
ἀνάσσει 9.4; Αἰώνων βασιλεῦ
9.7; Αἰὼν 11.71.
Ἀλκυόνη: Ἀλκυόνη
11.30.
Ἀλληκτώ: Ἀλληκτώ 15.9.
Ἀνάγκη: Ἀνάγκαις 10.1; Ἀνάγκης
11.5; Ἀνάγκη 15.49.
Ἀντολίη: Ἀντολίη 7.22.
Ἀπόλλων: ἀναξ Ἀπόλλων 1.1;
Ἀπόλ[λ]ων 8.7; Ἀπ[ό]λλωνος

3.32; φυτὸν Ἀπόλλωνος 7.1,
8.31; φυτὸν Ἀπόλλω[νο]ς 8.1;
Ἄπολλον 7.11; Φοῖβε Ἀπόλλ[ον]
8.16.
Ἄρτεμις: Ἄρτεμι 12.2, 14.6, 15.23;
Ἄρτεμιν 15.21.
Ἄτροπος: Ἄτροπός 7.32; Ἄτροπος
15.8.
Ἀφροδίτη: Ἀφροδίτη 12.30.
Βασκοσύνη: Βασκοσύναις 10.1.
Βαυβώ: Βαυβώ 14.2.
Βριμώ/βριμώ: 11.29; ἦω φορβά
Βριμώ 11.48.
Γαβριήλ: 1.7.
Δάφνη/δάφνη: δά[φνης] 3.27;
δάφνης 6.6; δάφνη 7.1, 8.1, 31;
Δάφνη 8.32; δάφνην
13.7A–B.
Δίκη: Δίκη 15.7, 50.
Διώνη: Διώνης 14.1.
Δύσις/δύσις: δύσιν 1.9, 3.23; Δύσις
7.23.
Ἑκάτη: Ἑκάτη 10.29, 14.1, 10, 23,
28; Ἑκάτην 13.28A, 15.20;
Ἑκάταν 14.12.
Ἑρεσχιγὰλ: Ἑρεσχιγὰ(λ) 10.16;
ἀκτιῶφι Ἑρεσχιγὰλ
νεβουτοσουαληθ 14.26.
Ἑρινός: Ἑρινόν 10.17; Ἑρινὺς 11.95;
Ἑρινύς 15.50.
Ἑρμῆς: Ἑρμῆς ὁ πρέσβυς 11.47;
Ἑρμῆ 11.86; Ἑρμῆν 13.28A.
Ζεὺς: Ζηνὸς μεγάλιοι 1.5; Διὸς
3.14; Διὸς γαιήοχον ὄμμα 7.14;
Διὸς τέκος 12.1, 15.45.
Ἥλιος: Ἥλιε χρυσοκόμα 2.2;
Ἥελι 7.14; Ἥλιος 11.69; Ἥλιου
Ἅσιριδος 11.98.
Ἰάω/ιαω: 1.5, 3.14, 2.22B,
8.20.
Ἰήϊος: Ἰήϊε 7.3, 29.
Ἰίσις: Ἰσιδος 11.47, 98.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

Κέρβερος: Κέρβερος 11.21;
 κλειθρα Κερβέρου 11.50;
 Κέρβερον 15.51.
 Κλωθώ: Κλωθώ 7.32, 11.7,
 15.8.
 Κόρη/κόρη: Ταρτάρου Κόρη 10.4;
 Κόρη 11.58, 100; Κούρη 14.4;
 Κούρα 14.23.
 Κρόνος: Κρόνος 11.72, 15.40;
 Κρόνου 11.83; Κρόνοιο
 15.38.
 Λάχεσις: Λάχεσις 15.8.
 Λάχης: Λάχης 7.32.
 Λοιμός: Λοιμῶ 10.1.
 Μέγαιρα: Μέγαιρα 15.9.
 Μελιούχος: Μελιούχε 8.24.
 Μήνη/μήνη: μή(ν)ης 9.13;
 Μήνη{ν} 11.23; Μήνην 13.27A,
 15.20; Μήνη 11.36, 12.21.
 Μιχαήλ: 1.6; Μ[ιχαήλ 3.17.
 Μοῖρα: Μοίραις 1.30, 10.1; νήματα
 Μοιράων 2.19A; Μοιρῶν 2.20A,
 23B; νήματα Μοιρῶν 15.7;
 Μοῖραι τρισαῖ 7.32; Μοῖραι
 11.74; Μοῖρα 15.50.
 Μούσα: Μουσάων σκηπτουχε
 7.28.
 Νύξ: Νύξ 7.25, 15.49.
 Ὅσπρις: Ἡλίου Ὅσίριδος 11.98.
 Παιάν: Παιήνι 1.1; Παιάν 7.3.
 Πάν: Πανὸς 11.63; Πάν 13.19A–B.
 Πειθώ: Πειθῶ 12.22.
 Περσεφόνη: Περσέφασσα 10.4;
 Περσεφόνη 12.2, 15.9, 23;
 Περσεφόνα 14.25.
 Ῥαφαήλ: Ῥ[αφαήλ? 3.15.
 Σαβῶθ: Σα[βῶθ 3.22; σιαωθ
 Σ[αβ]ῶθ 8.24; Σαβῶθ 8.32.
 Σελήνη/σελήνη: σελήνη 4.7;
 Σελήνην 8.30; Σελήνη 12.3, 20,
 31, 13.21B, 15.1, 24.
 Σμινθεύς: Σμινθεῦ 8.27.

Τηθύς: Τηθύς 11.70.
 Τιτάν: Τιτάν 3.13, 7.8.
 Τύχη/τύχη: Τύχη θεῶν καὶ
 δαιμόνων 13.22A–B.
 Φθόνος: Φθόνω 10.1.
 Φοῖβος: Φοῖβε 6.1, 7.30; Φοῖβε
 Ἀπόλλ[ον] 8.16; Φ]οῖβος 8.2;
 Φοῖβοιο ἐταίρη 8.32.
 Φύσις: Φύσι 15.33.
 Χάος /χάος: χάεός 1.21, 2.8; χάος
 12.12; Χάος 15.49.
 Χάρις: Χαρίτων 15.6.
 Ὠκεανός/ὠκεανός: Ὠκεανῶ
 7.24.
 Ὠρος: Ὠρ' 2.20A, 23B.

Voces magicae

ααααααα· εεεεεεε· ηηηηηηη· ιιιιι·
 οοοοοοο· υυυυυυυ·
 ωωωωωωω· 7.27.
 ἀβῶθ: εἰουτ ἀβῶθ 10.14.
 Ἀβρασάξ: 1.8, 3.16.
 Ἀδωναί: Ἀ]δωναί 1.9; Ἀδωνα[ι
 3.23.
 ἀδωναῖος: ἀδωναῖον 1.16.
 αηγιουω: 3.33.
 αεω: αεω εω 6.9.
 αηωηη: 11.59.
 ακραμμαχαρι: ακραμμαχ[αρι
 3.26.
 ἀκτιῶφι: 13.21A–B; ἀκτιῶφι
 Ἐρεσχινάλ νεβουτοσουαληθ
 14.26.
 αλλαλαα· αλλαλαα· σανταλαα·
 ταλαα: 6.4.
 αλλαλεθω: 10.15.
 αμελχεριβιουθ : 13.24A.
 αμερρ: ηωαιου αμερρ ουωωθ
 ιῶωη 5.8.

- αραραχααρα: αραραχααρα
ηφθισικηρε 15.43.
αραραχχαα: αραραχχαα
ηφθισικηρε 7.31.
ἀρβαθιάω: 8.26, 10.14.
αρβεθω: 8.26.
αχαϊφωθωθωαϊηϊαη
αϊηαϊηϊαωθωθωφιαχα : 1.31;
αχαϊφωθωθωφιαχααϊη
ηϊαιαηηϊαθωθωφιαχα 2.21A;
αχαϊφωθωθωαϊηϊαηαϊ
ιαηαϊηϊαωθωθωφιαχα
2.24B.
βαθυπνου: 13.23B.
βαρω: φορβα φορβωβαρ βαρω
φωρφωρ φωρβαϊ 10.29.
βαυβααραβας: 10.16.
βορβοροφόρβα: βορβοροφόρβα
10.3, cf. 15 (βορβοροφόρβα).
βορφοροφόρβα: 10.15, cf. 3
(βορβοροφόρβα).
βουλλον: 13.23B.
βουοφορβη: βουοφορβη
πανφορβα φορβαα 14.26.
βυθουπνουσαν: 13.23A.
εηϊεϊηϊω[. . .]ιαηηϊη ια ιαω ιαω
η [. . .]ουω: 8.19.
ειουτ: ειουτ ἀβάωθ 10.14.
ἐλωαϊος: ἐλωαϊον 1.17.
ενουρτιλαη: 13.23B.
εντοχε: 13.24B.
ενφνου: 10.16.
Ἐρεσχιάλ: Ἐρεσχιά(λ) 10.16;
ἀκτιῶφι Ἐρεσχιάλ
νεβουτοσουαληθ 14.26.
εσορτιλης: 13.23B.
εστοχεθ: 13.24A.
εω: αεω εω 6.9.
ζουχεπιττοη: 2.22B.
ηνωρ: θενωβ τιθεληβ ηνωρ
τενηνωρ 14.36.
ηταρονκον: 13.23A.
ηφθισικηρε: αραραχχαα
ηφθισικηρε 7.31.
ηφθισικηρε: αραραχααρα
ηφθισικηρε 15.43.
ηω: ηω φορβα Βριμὸς 11.48.
ηωαιου: ηωαιου αμερρ ουωθ
ιῶωη 5.8.
θενωβ: θενωβ τιθεληβ ηνωρ
τενηνωρ 14.36.
θωρενθα: 13.24B.
ϊαγχωθιτυλα: ἱαωαωο
ϊαγχωθιτυλα 8.33.
ιαω/Ίάω: 1.5, 3.14; ιαω 2.22B; ἱαω
8.20.
ἱαωαωο: ἱαωαωο ἱαγχωθιτυλα
8.32.
ἱμουη: 13.24B.
ιῶωη: ηωαιου αμερρ ουωθ ιῶωη
5.8.
ἱω ιμι: 13.23B.
ιωϊ: ιωϊ λοιμου λαλον 13.23A.
ιωσαχωτου: 10.14.
καθινβεραο: 13.23A.
καλλιδηχμα: καλλιδηχμα καὶ σαβ
14.37.
κυζαλευουσα: κυζαλευουσα παζαους
14.36.
λαητωνιον: λαητωνιον καὶ
ταβααωθ 6.9.
λαϊλαμ: 2.22B; μαρμαραυθ
λαϊλαμ σουμαρτα 5.9.
λαλαοϊθ: 10.14.
λαλον: ιωϊ λοιμου λαλον
13.23A.
λοιμου: ιωϊ λοιμου λαλον
13.23A.
μαρζουνη: 12.22.
μαρμαραυθ: μαρμαραυθ
λαϊλαμ σουμαρτα 5.8-9.
μασκελλι μασκελλω: μασκελλι
μασκελλω φνουκενταβαωθ
ὄρεοβαζάγρα ρηξιχθων

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- ἰππόχθων, ὄρεοπηγανύξ,
 μορμοροντοκουμβαι
 14.29.
 Μελιούχος: Μελιούχε 8.24.
 μεσεγκριφι: 8.23.
 μιβεραθ: 13.24B.
 μορκα: 10.16.
 μορμοροντοκουμβαι: μασκελλι
 μασκελλω φνουκενταβαωθ
 ὄρεοβαζάγρα ῥήξιχθων
 ἰππόχθων, ὄρεοπηγανύξ,
 μορμοροντοκουμβαι 14.29.
 νεβουτοσουαλήθ: Ἐρεσχιγά(λ)
 νεβουτοσουαλήθ 10.16; Βριμῶ
 σαχι νεβουτοσουαληθ 11.48;
 νεβουτοσουαλήθ 13.22A–B;
 ἀκτιῶφι Ἐρεσχιγάλ
 νεβουτοσουαληθ 14.27.
 νουμυλλον: 13.23B.
 ουωθ: ηαίου αμερρ ουωθ
 ιυῶη 5.8.
 ὄργογοργονιοτριαν: 10.17.
 ορενθα : 13.24A.
 ὄρεοπηγανύξ: μασκελλι μασκελλω
 φνουκενταβαωθ ὄρεοβαζάγρα
 ῥήξιχθων ἰππόχθων,
 ὄρεοπηγανύξ,
 μορμοροντοκουμβαι 14.29.
 οτονυπον: 8.33.
 παζαους: κυζαλεουσα παζαους
 14.37.
 πακερβηθ: 1.10.
 πανφορβα: βουορφορβη
 πανφορβα φορβαρα 14.26.
 πευχρη: 8.25.
 πυπυληδεδεζω: 14.27.
 Σαβῶθ: Σα[βῶθ 3.22; σιαωθ
 Σ[αβ]ῶθ 8.24; Σαβῶθ 8.32.
 σανκανθαρα: 13.24B.
 σαχι: Βριμῶ σαχι
 νεβουτοσουαληθ 11.48.
 σεσενγενβαρφαραγγη:
 σεσε[νγενβ]αρφαραγγης 3.20;
 σεσενγενβαρφαραγγ(γ)ης 8.25.
 Σημέα: 3.9.
 σιαωθ: σιαωθ Σ[αβ]ῶθ 8.24.
 σορενθα: 13.24B.
 σουμαρτα: μαρμαραυωθ λαῖλαμ
 σουμαρτα 5.9.
 συνατρακαβι: 10.15.
 σφνουθι: 13.24.
 ταβαραωθ: λαητωνιον καὶ
 ταβαραωθ 6.9.
 τενηνωρ: θενωβ τιθεληβ ηνωρ
 τενηνωρ 14.36.
 τιθεληβ: θενωβ τιθεληβ ηνωρ
 τενηνωρ 14.36.
 φνουκενταβαωθ: μασκελλι
 μασκελλω φνουκενταβαωθ
 ὄρεοβαζάγρα ῥήξιχθων
 ἰππόχθων, ὄρεοπηγανύξ,
 μορμοροντοκουμβαι 14.29.
 φορβα: φορβα φορβωβαρ βαρω
 φωρφωρ φωρβαῖ 10.29; ηω
 φορβα Βριμῶ 11.48.
 φορβαρα: βουορφορβη
 πανφορβα φορβαρα 14.26.
 φορβωβαρ: φορβα φορβωβαρ
 βαρω φωρφωρ φωρβαῖ 10.29.
 φυνευμεδωδω: 4.4.
 φωρβαῖ: φορβα φορβωβαρ βαρω
 φωρφωρ φωρβαῖ 10.29.
 φωρφωρ: φορβα φορβωβαρ
 βαρω φωρφωρ φωρβαῖ 10.29.
 χθεθωινι: 2.22B.
 ψακερβα : 10.14.

